





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

A C T S

OF

THE DIOCESAN SYNOD,

HELD IN

THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH

OF EXETER,

BY

HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER,

ON

WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY, AND FRIDAY,

JUNE 25, 26, 27, OF THE YEAR OF OUR LORD 1851.

By Authority.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1851.

LONDON :

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD STREET HILL.

ACTS OF THE SYNOD OF EXETER.

	PAGE
THE Bishop's Letter to the Archdeacons, convoking the Diocesan Synod	1
Matters to be considered at the Synod	2
Assembling of the Synod	3
Sermon preached before the Synod, by the Rev. Prebendary Hole .	3—24
Register of the Members of the Synod present	24—26
Prayers said at the commencement of the Synod	26

SESSION I.—

1. The Bishop's Address to the Synod	27—38
2. Declaration I.—On Baptism	39
3. Declaration II.—On Secession to Rome	40—43
4. Declaration III.—On the Roman Catholic Bishopric of Plymouth	43—45

SESSION II.—

1. Declaration I. on Baptism (<i>renewed</i>)	45—56
2. On the Exeter Diocesan Training College	57—60
Resolution 1 (on Training College), p. 58.	
3. On School Inspection	60—79
Resolution 2 (on Diocesan Inspectors), p. 64.	
Resolution 3 (on Instructions to Inspectors), p. 69.	
Resolution 4 (on Episcopal Sanction to Inspectors), p. 69.	
Plan of Examination, &c. p. 70.	
Resolution 5 (on Certificates of Merit from the Bishop), p. 73.	
Resolution 6 (on the Diocesan Board), p. 73.	
Resolution 7 (on a Paid Inspector), p. 73.	
4. On Catechising	80—91
Resolution 8 (on Catechising), p. 84.	

SESSION III.—

1. On continued Pastoral Superintendence of the Young	91—109
Resolution 9 (on Appointment of Committee to consider the subject), p. 108.	
2. On Ordaining Permanent Deacons	109—115
Resolution 10 (on the Diaconate), p. 109.	
3. On Lay Assistance	115—118
Resolution 11 (on Lay Assistance), p. 115.	
4. On Increase of Services and Celebration of Holy Com- munion	118—121
Resolution 12 (on Daily Service—the Observance of Holy Days—more frequent Celebration of Holy Communion, and Observance of Ascension Day), p. 121.	
Prayers said at the conclusion of the Synod	122

APPENDIX :—

Additional Note to the Bishop's Address, at p. 33 . . .	123—124
---	---------

ACTS OF THE SYNOD OF EXETER.

IN a Pastoral Letter issued to the Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, in April 1851, the Bishop declared his intention of holding a Diocesan Synod. The mode of summoning the Synod was announced in the following letter :—

Southmoulton, April 28, 1851.

Dear Mr. Archdeacon,—Having announced to my Clergy my purpose of holding, with God's permission, a Synod of the Diocese, soon after the conclusion of my present Visitation, I now request you to desire the Deans Rural to inform the Presbyters, whether beneficed or licensed, in their several Deaneries, that I have fixed on Wednesday, the 25th June next, for the meeting of the Synod, to be continued on the two following days.

We shall assemble, first, in the Chapter-room, and proceed thence to the Cathedral, at the usual hour of Morning Prayer; and after having received together the Holy Eucharist, will return to the Chapter-room, which the Dean and Chapter have permitted us to use for that purpose.

The one great question which duly I shall submit to the Synod, will be the fitness of our making a declaration of our firm adherence to that great Article of the Creed, "I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins;" as well as to the doctrine of our Church on the grace of that sacrament, as set forth in the Catechism.

On the other two days we will discuss such matters of practical interest as shall seem best calculated, with God's blessing, to promote the great ends of our ministry, avoiding all questions of controversial theology.

It is manifest that so numerous a body cannot usefully be brought together except by representation. I therefore invite the Clergy of every Deanery to elect two of their own number, together with their Deans Rural, to meet me, the Dean and the greater Chapter, my Chaplains, and the officials of the Archdeacons.

This election, however, it may be better to defer till within a short time before the proposed meeting. In the meanwhile, the questions to be proposed for consideration will be fixed. For this purpose I would desire the Deans Rural to call together, or otherwise to invite their Clergy, to transmit to me any questions which they may recommend for the consideration of the Synod.

It is desirable that such questions be proposed six weeks before the 25th of June, in order that I may select such as seem fittest, and submit them to the deliberation of the Clergy of the several Deaneries a month before that day.

This will give sufficient time for their deliberation, and for electing their representatives.

As it is important that these representatives should have the full confidence of those from whom they are sent, I would wish that no one be considered as elected who has not an actual majority of the votes of those who are present, and the holders of the proxies of those who are absent. This would be best secured by electing each separately.

The Clergy of every Deanery may send their opinions on the different questions to be proposed through their representatives, who will, however, be free to give their own judgment on those questions in the Synod.

We may humbly hope that this and future similar meetings may be a means of giving both to the Bishop and to the Clergy at large the benefit of mutual consultation on various matters, which shall from time to time arise, of important consequence to our ministerial usefulness, and therefore to the edification of our people.

I am, dear Mr. Archdeacon, your affectionate friend and brother in Christ,
H. EXETER.

And, subsequently, the following paper was transmitted to the Rural Deans, for the consideration of themselves and the representatives of the parochial Clergy :—

Matters which will be considered at the Diocesan Synod to be holden (God willing) in the Cathedral at Exeter, on Wednesday, 25th June next, and the two following days.

On the 25th will be proposed :—

I. A declaration of adherence to the article of the Nicene Creed, "I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins;" and especially to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and the articles and formularies of our own Church, on the spiritual grace given to infants in the holy sacrament of baptism.

II. A declaration of adherence generally to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, as now set forth in the Articles of Religion and in the Book of Common Prayer; and of our firm belief that secession from our Church, being a sound branch of the Catholic Church, to any other religious community, is an act of schism; and, in particular, that secession to the Church of Rome involves the abandonment of truth for error, and is perilous to salvation.

III. A declaration against the recent schismatical assignment of a bishopric of Plymouth by the Pope.

On the 26th and 27th the following subjects will be considered, so far as the time shall admit :—

1. Education according to the principles of the Church of England. Schools for the poor, middle schools, training college of masters at Exeter, of mistresses at Truro. Inspection of schools.

2. Catechising.—Best mode of carrying out the requirements of the Church, as stated in the rubrics and canons.

3. Continued pastoral superintendence of the young, who have left school; especially the encouragement of the living together of young agricultural labourers, on a plan at once economical, and under regulations for self-discipline, in agricultural colleges (see "Parochial Work," by Rev. E. Monro, pp. 184—198, Second Edition).

4. Increasing the number of authorized teachers and assistants of ministers, by the ordaining of permanent deacons, especially of teachers duly recommended from the training college at Exeter.

5. Assistance of lay parishioners to the parochial clergy, especially by encouraging voluntary associations for good works.

6. More frequent Divine services in churches on week-days. Due observance of the days appointed by the Church to be kept holy. On Ascension-day the Lord's Supper to be always administered.

7. More frequent celebration of the holy communion.

8. Separation of services, especially in connexion with the two immediately preceding questions.

9. Public performance of public baptism of infants; and right of parents, giving due notice, to require the public baptism of their children on holy-days.

10. Care to be taken in reminding sponsors of their real responsibility, and correcting false notions of that responsibility. The encouragement of bodies of persons (especially Sunday-school teachers, district visitors, and other lay parishioners) agreeing to undertake the office of sponsors in cases where it shall be found necessary.

11. Churching of women after illegitimate births, under what regulations?

12. Whether the office of burial ought not to be always fully and equally performed over all that are buried (except the taking the corpse into the church, where there is danger of infection)—advising the minister, who may doubt whether the party to be buried fall within any of the exceptions in the first rubric before the office of burial, to refer his doubt, with as little delay as possible, to the Bishop, for his solution, according to the direction contained in the preface, "Concerning the Service of the Church."

13. Selection of metrical versions of psalms and of hymns.

14. Receiving persons into the Church from the Romanist schism in this country, or from other schismatical communities—after previous reference of the several cases to the Bishop for his direction.

15. Whether to remarry those who, having been previously married before the registrar, may desire the blessing of the Church.

S. Gluvias, May 23, 1851.

H. EXETER.

On WEDNESDAY, the Twenty-fifth of JUNE, in the year of our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Fifty-one,

The Right Reverend HENRY, by Divine Permission, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER, held a Diocesan Synod at Exeter.

The Bishop with the Clergy attended the Morning Prayer in the Cathedral, when the following Sermon was preached by the Rev. George Hole, Rector of Chulmleigh and Prebendary :—

“ Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hast heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. That good thing which was committed unto thee keep by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.”—2 Tim. i. 13, 14.

WITH these words did the blessed Apostle, when ready to be offered, and on the point of his departure out of this world, instruct and exhort his “ true”¹ his “ dearly-beloved son.”² The parting sayings of all men are weighty; the counsels of Fathers, Pastors, Rulers, and Guides of Nations—who does not acknowledge the force which these acquire from the solemnities of a dying hour?

But if this be true of ordinary men, it must be true in an eminent degree of an Apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ; and, if to all his writings, inspired equally by the Holy Spirit of Truth, we gladly turn at all times, for “ doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,”³ it is natural, surely, to refer with a deeper than ordinary interest, in a period of the Church’s trials, to the last Epistle of S. Paul; penned by him when his race was well-nigh run, and the goal was almost in sight, and the crown of the Conqueror was all but placed upon his brow by the hand of his Lord and Judge.

At such a moment, what was the view presented to his mind, as he looked upon the Church’s present and future militant state on earth? What were the counsels which this “ master” in Christ’s new Israel would leave to his scholar, “ from whose head he was shortly to be taken?”⁴ What charge would S. Paul give to a Bishop of the Church of Christ, for his own

¹ Tim. i. 2.

² 2 Tim i. 2.

³ 2 Tim. iii. 16.

⁴ 2 Kings ii. 3.

salvation, and the salvation of those committed to his care?—for the guidance of the Church through surrounding dangers,—for the preservation of the good deposit of the Faith entrusted to his keeping, until the coming of the Lord?

Bear with me, Brethren, if I ask you to consider these questions, in order that the inquiry may lead us onward to the calm discussion of one main end and purpose of our assembling in this House of God to-day, and of the means by which our coming together here may, through the grace and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, (present, as we trust, with us who are gathered now in His name,) promote the honour and glory of the Lord, the preservation of His pure and undefiled Faith—and “if it be possible”¹—all things are possible with Him!²—may bring peace—peace built upon the only sure foundation of truth—peace unto “His Israel!”³ Amen.

What, then, was the prospect which the Apostle, when he was himself nearing the haven of his own rest, beheld in the Church of Christ? It was such as the other Apostles of the Lord once saw on the Sea of Galilee, when—perhaps to give them a foretaste of their future trials, and to train them to confidence and sure trust in Him—our Saviour left them alone, as it seemed, toiling at their oars, against wind and waves, throughout three long watches of the night, in imminent jeopardy!⁴ Such gloom must have seemed to overcast the Church’s sky—through such waves and storms must the vessel have appeared to S. Paul destined to take her course, when his portion of the toil was nearly done. For he had seen, in one Church, planted by his own hand, factions and schisms rending the Body of Christ; leaders set up, and followed, instead of *Him* who died for them, in Whose name they had been baptized; “debates” (the fruit of factions always) “and strifes, backbitings and whisperings, swellings and tumults,” and deadly heresy, even to the denial of the Foundation—the Resurrection of the Dead.⁵ In another place, those, whose attachment to the Apostle himself, and to the truth which they once held in its purity, had been such, that, in his own strong phrase, they would have “plucked out their eyes and given them to him,” had been “fascinated” by some baleful influence, turned away from the truth of Christ’s pure Gospel unto another—which was

¹ Rom. xii. 18.

² Matt. xiv. 26.

³ Gal. vi. 16.

⁴ Matt. xiv. 24, 25; Mark vi. 47, 48.

⁵ 1 Cor. i. 10—13; 2 Cor. xii. 20; 1 Cor. xv.

not another Gospel, but a corruption of it—deserving the Anathema of the Apostle.¹ From Christ, the Fountain of Pardon, and Peace, and Life, they were gone back, in their folly and delusion, to the shadows and forms of the extinct law, “weak and beggarly elements”—such they were become—a childish, and, when opposed to Christ’s Gospel, a superstitious and anti-christian, system.² It was a bondage that their fathers could not bear, yet they had stooped, and taken the yoke upon their necks again.³ This apostasy from the truth had S. Paul seen: with how great sorrow and anxiety he saw this, his Epistle to the Galatians is a sufficient testimony. And now was he writing to his beloved son Timothy from a Roman prison. Once he had been in the very jaws of “the lion,” and plucked thence by the hand of the Lord.⁴ Around him had been faint hearts and failing spirits; one, of whom he once had good hope, had forsaken him, seduced by the world’s hopes and fears:⁵ at the moment of trial,—he had drank of his Lord’s cup in this,—“no man stood with him;” “all forsook me,” saith he, save One, greater than all, who stood by, and strengthened and rescued him.⁶

Yet it was a respite only; for he knew that the time of his sacrifice was close at hand—*ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι*, said he, “The Altar is ready, the sacrificial sword well-nigh drawn—mine “will be the blood of the victim shortly to be poured out.”⁷ Such prospects were before his eyes at that time. And for the future—it was revealed to him by the prophetic Spirit, that “perilous times should come,” when the pure faith, “once for all delivered to the Church,” should be in jeopardy; heresy, as “a gangrene,” endeavouring to fasten upon it, and destroy its life, fables and shadows preferred before it. “Men would “become self-lovers, boasters, proud, headstrong and high-minded, unwilling to submit to the Truth;” unable to endure sound doctrine for the correction of error; but imbibing readily the doctrines of “seducing spirits,” which would abound, and wax worse and worse, “deceiving and being deceived.”⁸ And beyond all these clouds that were gathering in, the Apostle saw in the Spirit, the thick dark tempest of the final apostasy, lowering in the

¹ Gal. iv. 15; iii. 2; i. 6—9.

² Gal. iv. 3, 9, 10; iii. 3; v. 1—4.

³ Acts xv. 10; Gal. iv. 21—31; v. 1.

⁴ 2 Tim. iv. 17.

⁵ Col. iv. 14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. iv. 10; i. 15.

⁶ 2 Tim. iv. 16, 17; John xvi. 32; Matt. xxvi. 56.

⁷ 2 Tim. iv. 6, 7.

⁸ 2 Tim. iii. 1—4; Jude 3; 2 Tim. ii. 17; iv. 3, 4; 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 13.

distant horizon of the Church; at first like the cloud seen by the prophet's servant on Carmel, not larger than a man's hand, then growing onwards, and casting its lurid shadows before through successive ages, till in the last days the mystery of iniquity should be completed, and the lawless one should be revealed in his full maturity and power of evil, to be "consumed by the brightness of the presence of the Lord at His coming."¹

And how did he who beheld such a prospect teach his beloved son, and in him all Bishops and Pastors, nay, all members of Christ's holy Church, in their place and order, that they might be forewarned and forearmed against those perils? I pass by his spirit-stirring words, exhorting Timothy to courage and constancy, to be "strong in the grace of Christ;" to watch, to endure, to stand in his assigned post, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ. I ask your attention, Brethren, to his one weighty charge given in my text. "Hold fast (saith the Apostle) the "form of sound words which thou hast heard of me, in faith "and love which is in Christ Jesus." "That good thing," (that precious deposit,) "which was committed unto thee, keep by the "Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us."

As if he had said—Be the perils which I have spoken of what they may,—the perplexities of thy course, however great—let the attacks upon the Faith come from what quarter soever,—with whatsoever subtlety of error;—take the rule and pattern of the true faith, the form,² and original draught, and outline of sound doctrine which I taught thee at the beginning. This will be a light and guide to thee in dark and troublous times. Take this as a test of truth and error, and it will detect falsehood, and preserve thee in thine integrity. Hold this fast as a

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 3—8.

² ὑποτύπωσιν ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων. See Bp. Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, part ii. vol. x. p. 459. Heber's edit.

Καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ζωγράφων, ἐνετυπώσαμέν, φησιν, εἰκόνα σοι τῆς ἀρετῆς, καὶ τῶν τῷ θεῷ δοκούντων ἀπάντων, ὥσπερ τινα κανόνα, καὶ ἀρχέτυπον, καὶ ὕρου καταβαλὼν εἰς τὴν σὴν ψυχὴν ταῦτα οὖν ἔχε· καὶ περὶ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ καὶ περὶ ἀγάπης, καὶ περὶ σωφρονισμοῦ δὲ τι βουλευσασθαι, ἐκείθεν λάμβανε τὰ παραδείγματα· οὐ δέσσει σοι παρ' ἐτέρων εἰκόνα ζητεῖν, πάντων ἐκεῖ κατάκειμένων.

"As is the custom of painters," (such is the comment of S. Chrysostom upon the place, "I have delineated for thee an image of virtue, and of all things pleasing to God, impressing this as it were a rule, and archetype, and outline upon thy soul. This then retain, and if thou requirest any counsel concerning faith, or love, or sobriety, from thence take thy pattern; thou wilt not need to seek a model from any other, having all things there laid up." "Follow the example," saith Theodoret on this passage, "of painters, and as they paint their pictures, paying the closest attention to the originals, so do thou retain as a kind of archetype, that

sacred trust,¹—a pledge deposited with thee, to be kept at all hazards, through all trials, as thou wilt answer it to thy Lord who has left it with thee.—Keep this trust, not by thy own might or wisdom, but “by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us.”

I will not stay to refer you at length to the many places of S. Paul’s own writings, where he speaks in a similar way of what must have been some definite rule of doctrine, such as this “form of sound words,” in which he had instructed Timothy. You will readily recal to your recollection, the way in which he brings back the Church of Corinth from their heresy respecting the resurrection—to the foundations of the faith which he had received and delivered to them ἐν πρώτοις²—and his recital there of the articles of “the death, and burial, and resurrection of the Lord,” in the very terms of our Creed. You will recal his “*first principles of the oracles of God*.”³ His “*principles of the doctrine of Christ*,” making up “*the foundation*” of which he speaks to the Hebrews, enumerating there certain articles of doctrine, an example of the ὑποτύπωσις of which our text speaks. You will remember in both his Epistles to Timothy,⁴ the frequent mention of the special “*charge*”—the “*commandment*,”⁵ given him—the “*mystery of the faith*,”—the “*mystery of godliness*,” which he was to hold fast, not to depart from, lest he should make, as others had, “shipwreck of the faith”—the doctrine, which S. Timothy having received from S. Paul, was to commit to trusty men, who should transmit the same to others in succession after him—the faith, which “the

doctrine concerning faith and love which thou hast received of me.” And in the same strain Theophylact. (See Suicer, in v. ὑποτύπωσις.)

¹ παρακαταθήκην. “Quid est ‘depositum?’ id est, quod tibi creditum est, non quod a te inventum; quod accepisti, non quod excogitasti; rem non ingenii, sed doctrinæ; non usurpationis privatæ, sed publicæ traditionis; rem ad te perductam, non a te prolatam; in qua non auctor debes esse, sed custos; non institutor sed sectator; non ducens, sed sequens. ‘Depositum’ inquit ‘custodi,’ Catholicæ Fidei talentum, inviolatum, illibatumque conserva.” Vincent. Lirin. Commonit. c. xxii. Cited by Keble, Sermon on Primitive Tradition, p. 19, note; and by Dr. Pusey, in his Sermon on the Rule of Faith, (preached before the University on the Fifth Sunday after Epiphany;) who quotes the passage from the Oxford translation thus:—“Keep that which is committed to thee, not that which is invented of thee; that which thou hast received, not that which thou hast devised; a thing not of wit but of learning; not of private assumption, but of public tradition; a thing brought to thee, not brought forth of thee; wherein thou must not be an author, but a keeper; not a master, but a disciple; not a leader, but a follower. *Keep the deposit.* Preserve the talent of the Catholic faith safe and undiminished.” See Dr. Pusey’s Sermon, p. 7.

² 1 Cor. xv. 1—4.

⁴ See Keble’s Sermon, p. 16.

⁵ 1 Tim. vi. 14, 20; i. 18; iii. 9; iii. 16; i. 19; iii. 15; iv. 1.

³ Heb. v. 12; vi. 1, 2.

Church of God, the pillar and ground of the truth," was ordained to uphold and keep, as the firm barrier against the apostasy of the last times.¹

You will recollect also S. John's² test and touchstone of Heresy, by which the spirits of error were to be detected, their denial of a specific article of the Faith,³ "that Jesus Christ was come in the Flesh;" and his warning voice to the Church, in his own days, when the Gnostic Antichrists first appeared,—how much more needful a warning for the last days, when ὁ Ἀντιχριστὸς ἔρχεται!—his warning, that the Church's safety lay in holding fast the Rule of Faith at first taught by the apostles of the Lord, in keeping to the communion and fellowship established by them, in "abiding in the doctrine which they had heard from the beginning."⁴

And from all this, you will concur, I think, in the conclusion, that even in the Apostolic Church there existed a "Form of Doctrine"—a definite Rule of Faith, (differing in words, though the same in substance,) containing the first principles and foundations of the truth of the Gospel, which converts were taught, and the Churches held as the bond of unity and communion, which was a line of clear demarcation, ὁρος πίστεως,⁵ as it was afterwards called, within⁶ which was truth; beyond it error.

Could there be a doubt on this point, as respects the immediate age of the apostles, you, my Reverend Brethren, will recollect the clearness and certainty with which this truth appears in the early records of the Church's history: how the "form of sound words," the "*Rule of Faith*," and the one great principle of "*holding it fast*," and preserving it pure and inviolate, as *the trust and deposit committed* "to the Church" of Christ by her Lord and Head, meet us almost everywhere. You need not to be reminded of the various forms of the Church's Creed collected by the labours of our own Divines⁷ from the first outlines, the ὑποτύπωσις in Irenæus, to the Nicene Confession, and the fuller recital of the ancient faith

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16; iv. 1.

² See Keble's Sermon, pp. 22, 26, 27.

³ 1 John iv. 1—3.

⁴ 1 John ii. 18—28.

⁵ Socrat. lib. v. c. 4, cited by Bingham, Antiq. Ch. Ch. book x. cap. iii. 2.

⁶ "By the actual retention of which truth it is, that the Church is rightly called 'the pillar and ground of truth' by S. Paul, and in relation to this S. Irenæus reckoned it to be all one, 'extra veritatem, id est, extra ecclesiam.'" Bp. Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery. Part ii. vol. x. p. 460. Heber's edit.

⁷ Bingham, Antiq. Ch. Ch. book x. cap. iv. Wall, Hist. of Inf. Bapt. part ii. cap. ix. sec. 10—13. Tertullian, Oxf. Tr. note P. p. 480. Bull, Judic. Eccl. Cath. c. iv. v. vi., with the notes of Grabe on these chapters.

by the Fathers at Constantinople, in the form in which we recite it in the Communion service at this very day.¹

You will remember with what distinctive titles these venerable charters and title-deeds of our inheritance were honoured. The *Kανὼν*,²—the standard rule by which orthodoxy and heresy were judged and examined; in adherence to which a man was considered sound in the Catholic faith, and in departing from it he deserted the truth,³ as it was known and acknowledged in all the Churches of Christendom. “*Regula Fidei, una omnino, sola immobilis, et irreformabilis.*” “*Regula quæ nullas apud nos habet quæstiones, nisi quas hæreses inferunt, et quæ hæreticos faciunt.*” “*Nihil ultra scire, omnia scire est.*” So speaks Tertullian.⁴ This faith, according to Irenæus, the “Church, though dispersed over all the world, unto the utmost borders of the earth, hath from the apostles and their disciples received: this, though she is spread far and wide, yet with all diligence she guards, as if she were but a dweller in a single house. These truths she equally embraceth, as if possessed but of one and the self-same heart and soul. These she proclaims with one harmonious consent, and teaches and delivers down as though she spoke but by one mouth. One and the same among the different dialects of the nations, even as the sun in all the world is one and the same. So this preaching of the truth shines everywhere, and enlightens all men who desire to come to the knowledge of the Truth. He which among the guides of the Church is best able to speak uttereth no more than this, and less than this the most simple doth not utter, when they make profession of their faith; *μίας γὰρ καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς πίστεως οὔσης, οὔτε ὁ πόλυ περὶ αὐτῆς δυνάμενος εἰπεῖν, ἐπλεόνασεν, οὔτε ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον ἡλαττόνησε.*”⁵

And this faith, this centre and source of light, more precious than the most precious jewel on earth, we have and hold in the Church of England at this day. We have it preserved and

¹ With the exception, of course, of the “Filioque” of the Western Church.

² Bingham, book xvi. c. 1, and x. iii. 2.

³ So the Council of Antioch said that Paulus Samosatensis was *ἀποστάς τοῦ κανόνος*. Bingham, ubi supra.

⁴ Tertull. de Vel. Virgin. c. 1. Id. de Præscript. Hæret. c. 14. See on the expression “Regula Fidei,” sec. 13 of Tertull. de Pr. H. Oxf. Tr. Note C.

⁵ Bull, Judic. Cath. Eccl. cap. iv. sec. v.

⁶ Hooker, Ecc. P. iii. 1. 5. Bingham, x. iv. 1. Routh, Script. Eccl. Opuscula, vol. ii. “The faith being one and the same, he that said most of it, could not enlarge it, nor he that said least, take any thing from it.”—Bingham.

guarded by the form of sound words, in which it has been enclosed, and kept from the hand of the spoiler, from the days of the solemn Synods of Nicæa and Constantinople unto this very day.

And if this be so, shall not those words of the blessed apostle in our text "*ista tanquam cyenea divini hominis vox et oratio*,"¹ his parting counsel, not to his beloved disciple only, but especially to us on whom the latter days are come—shall not S. Paul's saying sink down into our hearts, and, as if addressed to each one severally here to-day, move us to fervent zeal in obeying the charge which they contain? *ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχει ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων, τὴν καλὴν παρακαταθήκην φύλαξον διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος ἐν ἡμῖν.* "Hold fast the form of sound words—guard—jealously guard the precious deposit entrusted to thee by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in us." "By the gift of grace,—grace bestowed on thee in the laying on of hands,"² *τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν,*" by that grace given thee for the work and office of a Bishop, of a Priest, in the Church of God, guard the precious deposit which has been committed to thee.

We should take them, I said, as if they were spoken to each one severally present here this day. For to what purpose, Reverend Brethren, are we assembled here at this time? Is it not at the call of our Bishop, to³ consider matters pertaining to our pastoral office and ministry,—to the position of our Church in relation to the intrusion of the Romish hierarchy into this Diocese? Above, and before all, to declare our adherence to this Article of the Catholic Faith, "I acknowledge one Baptism for the Remission of Sins,"—our steadfast adherence to this "form of sound words" in its full bearing on the doctrine of Holy Baptism, and on the blessings conveyed in that Sacrament, to the infant children of the members of our Church?

The different portions of this Church in times of old⁴ met, as history tells us, in Diocesan Synods. So also since the Reformation⁵ have Dioceses met, as the existing records of their pro-

¹ Cicero.

² 2 Tim. i. 6. See the Ordinal of the Church.

³ See the List of Matters to be considered, &c. &c.

⁴ See in the Ecclesiastic, and Theol. for Sept. 1850, p. 172. "*Modus tenendi Synodos in Angliâ primævis temporibus*," from Spelman. Vol. ii. p. 1, &c.

⁵ Eccles. Theol. Sept. 1850, p. 176. The two instances of Diocesan Synods given in this article on "Convocation and Synods," from Wilkins, are of Synods in the Diocese of S. Asaph, in 1563, and 1683. In the same number are also given the Canons of Bishop Bedell's Synod of Kilmore, held in 1638.

Bishop Hall, in his Modest Offer to the Assembly of Divines at Westminster

ceedings testify, a few probably out of many that the registers of different Sees might furnish. So, above all, did Archbishop Cranmer, and his associates, to whom was committed the weighty task of the Reformation of the Ecclesiastical laws of the Church of England, declare it to be their mind and judgment,¹ that Dioceses should meet in Synod, and there confer and deliberate, the Bishops with their Clergy, of such things, as at the time required to be established or amended.² “Etenim aptissima “profecto”—such are the words of that code of Laws so prepared and³ almost made the law of the land—“aptissima profecto medicina synodus est, ad castigandam negligentiam et “tollendos errores.”

So little did the Archbishop, and the Divines, and Lawyers who joined in that statement suppose, that from such assemblies, there should by any possibility arise in future times, what has been apprehended from our assembly here to-day; a “dis-loyal questioning of the supremacy of the Crown, the separation of the Church from the State, fatal consequences to “the wellbeing of the nation, the existence of the monarchy, “and the maintenance of the principles of the Reformed Faith “throughout the world!”⁴

Oh! let us hope that these fears, springing, as they no doubt do, from zeal, and earnest feeling, and jealousy for truth and peace supposed to be in jeopardy, may be proved by the results of this assembly to be groundless. They will be surely groundless, if, as we have met together, according to the injunctions⁵ of the Archbishop and his Divines, and Canonists, with solemn services in this House of God, so in obedience to the same high authority, we shall kneel presently at the Holy Table, and seek there the special presence of our Lord, and the light and guidance of His Holy Spirit, and then retire, and in orderly deliberation consider, “Maximâ cum gravitate, summâque pace, “de his quæ maximè necessaria visa fuerint.”

in 1644, speaks of the use of Diocesan Synods in the determination of important questions, supposing some care and life were restored to this, and other parts of our Ecclesiastical Government.

¹ *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*. Dr. Cardwell's new edit. 1850. Tit. De Eccl. et Min. cap. 19—23.

² Cap. 19.

³ See Bishop of Exeter's Pastoral Letter, p. 5.

⁴ A Clerical Protest against the Diocesan Synod, addressed to the Lord Bishop of Exeter by certain Presbyters of the Diocese. Resolutions of a meeting of Lay members of the Church of England resident in this Diocese, held at the Athenæum, Exeter, May 31. Sir John Kenaway in the chair.

⁵ *Reformatio Legum Eccl.* cap. 21.

But among these most necessary matters, the things concerning the faith must have the chief place. So thought Bishop Bedell, in his Diocesan Synod at Kilmore, where, he tells us, they first consulted "*quibus rationibus fidei sinceritas conservari posset.*" So in the "*Reformatio Legum*" before cited, among the subjects to be considered by the Diocesan Synod, the first place¹ is given, as it ever was in the venerable Synods of the Universal Church, to the establishment of the faith in its integrity. "*Si qua corruptio veræ doctrinæ obrepserit corrigatur.*" And therefore, Brethren, will it be our first and weightiest duty to-day to affirm the true faith, and to declare our steadfast adherence to it, to comply with the parting counsel of the Apostle, "to hold fast the form of sound words, to guard the precious deposit which has been entrusted to us,—*Catholicæ Fidei talentum, inviolatum illibatumque conservare.*"

But why, it is asked by some,² Why affirm what has not been denied? Why declare adherence to an article of the faith, ever repeated by the Church in her Communion Service, in which we are ready at all times to express "our full and unshaken belief?"

Would that it could be truly said that this article of the faith had never been impugned! Yet let me speak the truth—speak it as S. Paul teaches, "in love,"³ and let it be seen, whether our affirmation of this portion of the Catholic faith be necessary or superfluous.

Let us take into our hands the Services of the Church. In her Baptismal Offices⁴ she teaches, that infants who are "born in sin, cannot enter into the kingdom of God, except they be born anew of water and the Holy Ghost." This grace, "which by nature they cannot have," prayer is offered unto God, that He "in His bounteous mercy will grant;" that "coming unto Holy Baptism, they may receive remission of their sins by Spiritual Regeneration." This release and remission of sins,—of original sin, for in the infant's case there can be no other,—is, through the tender mercy⁵ of our Lord, granted to them, in, and by the Sacrament of Holy Baptism; for so the Church speaks of the baptized infant; that he "who was born in original

¹ Cap. 22. *De Rebus in Synodo Episcopali tractandis.*

² See the Exeter Clerical and Lay Protest.

³ Ephes. iv. 15.

⁴ See Offices of Public and Private Baptism.

⁵ Luke i. 78.

“ sin, and in the wrath of God, is, by the laver of Regeneration
 “ in Baptism, received into the number of the children of God
 “ and heirs of everlasting life; for our Lord Jesus Christ doth
 “ not deny his grace and mercy unto such infants, but most
 “ lovingly doth call them unto him.”

Such is the Church's language; and with what earnestness she bids her members, who have brought their little ones to Christ's holy ordinance, “doubt not, but earnestly believe,” that their Lord hath then, and there, “favourably received” them, and “embraced them in His arms,”—is in the remembrance of every one, as it has been, I doubt not, engraven in the heart of every parent.

But it has been held,¹ that original sin in infants makes them “unworthy recipients of baptism, and hinders them from “receiving any benefit from that Sacrament, except there shall “have been a prevenient act of grace to make them worthy.”

Then is their baptism no baptism for the remission of original sin; and, if I hold this, and with the Church acknowledge, “one baptism for the remission of sins,” must I not interpret that Article of the Faith, (to make it consistent with my theory,) in a sense unknown to the Catholic Church of Christ? And if I do this, must I not greatly err? That is a question which deserves investigation,—calm, dispassionate inquiry. It is not a matter of party dispute—it is no mere strife of words—it touches the foundation of the Faith. I may apply Cyprian's words to it. (Ep. 14.) “Non paucorum, nec ecclesiæ unius, aut unius provinciæ, sed totius orbis hæc causa est;”—the whole Christian world has an interest in it. Certainly one large portion of it, those whose nearest and dearest interests are at stake in this matter, who cannot speak for themselves, do, by their very helplessness, and their tears, seem to entreat a hearing for a cause, in which their new birthright is in jeopardy. The infant children of our Church are suitors in this cause. *We* may not as ministers of Him,² who in the days of His flesh would have the little ones brought to Him for his blessing, and was never more displeased at anything, while He was on earth, than at their act and deed, who would have kept them from Him—as *His* servants, Reverend Brethren, *we* may not deny them a hearing, nor refuse their plea, that the

¹ Vide “Efficacy of Baptism,” by the Rev. G. C. Gorham, p. 83.

² Mark x. 13. Exhortation after the Gospel, in the Office of Public Baptism.

Saviour did, from the beginning,—“prevent them with the blessings of His goodness”¹—that, in His Holy Sacrament of baptism, “He declared” from the first “His good-will towards them,” by a pledge, and token, that cannot deceive, or disappoint—and, that in the Church’s Creed they have ever had a clear, an immemorial, an undisputed title-deed, to prove their claim to their inheritance among the disciples of the Lord Jesus.

Neither has this question been decided, nor is all further inquiry stayed, by the sentence of an infallible chair. It is a saying elsewhere, “*Roma locuta est, causa finitur* ;” and some, who would not, I am sure, willingly Romanize, have spoken, as if a transfer had been made of this power of finally deciding questions of the Faith to a Lay Tribunal in England; nay, as if the crown of our Gracious Queen were not complete, and perfect in its own proper majesty and glory, the false jewels of a foreign Tiara have been fastened by an inconsiderate hand upon the diadem of an English Sovereign; and “Absolute Supremacy, without limits in matters of the Faith,”² is the prerogative which it will be henceforth disloyal to call in question. And we may no more, as ministers of Christ’s word and Sacraments, “contend earnestly for the Faith,”³ and maintain it, if we believe it to be in jeopardy, because, not *Rome*,—which has prescription at least to plead for her usurped infallibility—but, a court erected by recent statutes,⁴ has spoken. “*Causa finita est*,” so it is said, because, not the so-called chair of Peter, but a Lay Tribunal, and that, not even of Churchmen, has judged a cause, which, but for an oversight,⁵ it would never even have taken cognisance of.

But let us calm our apprehensions. In entering on the consideration of the one point, which I am submitting to you to-day, we shall not, I trust, “present an example of resistance “to a solemn adjudication of the law, unbecoming our position as “ministers of religion;”⁶ for upon that one point, (I humbly state it as my conviction,) the law has not spoken,—as indeed, it being a matter of the Faith, it was not competent to speak,

¹ Ps. xxi. 3.

² Vide Report of a Meeting of members of the Church of England resident in the Diocese of Exeter, disposed to concur in a Protest by the Laity against the Synod.—Woolmer’s Gazette, June 7, 1851.

³ Jude, ver. 3.

⁴ 2 & 3 Will. IV., c. 92; and 3 & 4, Will. IV. c. 41.

⁵ Pastoral Letter by the Bishop of Exeter, 1851, p. 2.

⁶ Clerical and Lay Protest, 4.

having, "in controversies of the Faith, no authority."¹ Upon that one point, no solemn adjudication has been made. It was pressed, indeed, in the pleadings,² but passed by, wholly unnoticed, in the judgment given.³ It is a "matter of theological correctness or error of doctrine"⁴ upon which the Judges of the Appellate Court expressly abstained from pronouncing an opinion.

I do not say that the judgment which was pronounced, does not, virtually, and by inference, bear upon this point;—bear, with a weight that is very grievous to many consciences,—with a weight, that almost crushed at first the heart of the Church of England, and almost stayed for a time, as by some momentary shock, the pulsation that gives life, and health, and power to the body. Some have said, indeed, that all things are left in the same position as before,—The truth, the teaching of the Church, and the position of her ministers and members; yet, what are the views of the most accomplished, the most powerful adversary of that Church, (most powerful, because on principle her adversary,) on this point? He considers "That a matter of doctrine has "been decided, not by judges, but by the Queen, upon their "advice, and has been so decided, that, however any man may "endeavour to slip from the binding links of that award, it is a "chain round the Church of England; unless, by something more "than merely folding up its arms, and passively laying itself "down in its coils, it shall burst through it and cast it aside."⁵

Eloquent adversary! Yet, not by the might and power of man, but by the Spirit⁶ of her Divine Lord and Head, whose pure faith the Church, which you calumniate and deem heretical, yet holds, and by God's mercy shall still hold pure and undefiled—by the Spirit of her Redeemer shall the Church of England burst through whatever chains shall hinder her in her conflict with error, her maintenance of the true Catholic Faith.

¹ Twentieth Article of Religion, "The Church hath Authority in Controversies of Faith."

² Speech of E. Badeley, Esq., before the Privy Council in the Appeal of Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter, p. 205.

³ The single reference made in the Judgment to the Article of the Creed, spoke of it only in the bearing which it had upon the doctrine that Baptism was not to be repeated.—See Copy of the Judgment, &c., by Seeleys, London, 1850, p. 16.

⁴ Ibid. p. 20.

⁵ "The Papal and Royal Supremacies Contrasted." A Lecture by the Right Rev. N. Wiseman, D. D., Bishop of Melipotamus, V. A. L. Delivered at St. George's, Southwark, May 12, 1850. Richardson, London. p. 28.

⁶ Zech. iv. 6.

She will yet hold that faith pure and inviolate, aye, and yet hold the true supremacy of the Crown of England, and find in it an effectual barrier against the usurped supremacy of your foreign Prince and Prelate.¹

She will yet “render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s;”² which, if she were to bow her neck under the tyrannous yoke of your universal monarch, she could not do; and “the things “of God” she will “render unto God,” which the Sovereign of these realms would never claim, which the supreme Appellate Tribunal has not, intentionally, and by direct adjudication—however greatly you desire that it were so—has not taken away.

Forgive me, Brethren, if I have wandered, if I have spoken what I should not, or otherwise than I ought, and return with me to the point from whence we set out.

I stated it as my humble conviction, that in this *one point* which I am putting before you to-day, the special bearing of the article of the creed upon one special error that has been held, no deliberate sentence has been given; and if it be so, then you will rejoice with me that one strong objection taken against our proceedings here to-day has been removed; that we are occupying no questionable post of attack upon constituted authority, but our own legitimate field as Ministers of God, left open to us by that authority; the field of inquiry into the matters of the faith, “once for all delivered to the saints,”³ for which an apostle has exhorted us *ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι*, “earnestly to contend.”

If it be so, you will, with me, see through these clouds that are around us, a glimpse, perhaps, of a light breaking upon us, from a quarter where we looked not for it. “At evening time,” (said the prophet) “it shall be light.”⁴

Strange things have taken place at other times,

Via prima salutis,
Quod minime reris, Graiâ pandetur ab urbe.⁵

Even “out of the eater may come meat, and out of the strong sweetness;”⁶ and the sentence which has been thought by some fatal to the Catholicity of the Church of England, may be found no barrier to our reaffirming, as, by God’s blessing, we shall reaffirm to-day, that faith in its integrity; nay, may cause that

¹ Oath of Supremacy.

³ Jude, ver. 3.

⁵ Æn. vi. 96.

² Matt. xxii. 21.

⁴ Zech. xiv. 7.

⁶ Judges xiv. 14.

faith to be better understood, and more firmly and affectionately held than ever.

The point then—let me recall it to your recollection for a moment—is, that it has been held that original sin, is in itself such a hindrance to the right reception of baptism, that infants can have no benefit by that sacrament, except some prevenient act of grace shall have made them worthy.

The Catholic Faith is, “I believe one baptism for the remission of sins,” therefore, of original sin in infants. So the Church has ever understood that article, among other truths, to signify. The two doctrines cannot, it is plain, stand together. Is it then a fact, that the interpretation I have given to the creed, is the ancient and the true interpretation, or no? Had this article of the creed, “I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins,” a fixed determinate meaning in the Catholic Church? and does that meaning bind us to acknowledge that, in and by holy baptism, remission of original sin is given to infants? or, is it an imposition of a private opinion,¹ that is now sought to be substituted for an article of the faith?

The fathers of Constantinople, it is said,² had not the case of infants before them when they adopted this article into their form of faith. Other and earlier creeds expressed it thus, “I believe the forgiveness of sins,” without mention of baptism. Others thus, “I believe one baptism of repentance.” Is there any evidence that by the creed, as we recite it at this day, we are bound to hold the remission of original sin to all infants, in the sacrament of baptism?

Now we are indebted to the Pelagian heresy, or rather, to the good Providence of God, overruling evil, and bringing out of that heresy a fuller perception of his Truth, for an answer to these questions. “*Multa quippe*” (said S. Augustine)³ “*ad fidem Catholicam pertinentia, dum hæreticorum callidâ inquietudine agitantur, ut adversus eos defendi possint, et considerantur diligentius, et intelliguntur clarius, et instantius prædicantur, et ab adversario mota quæstio discendi existit occasio.*” So was the case with this question of the remission of original sin to all infants in the Sacrament of Baptism.

¹ See the last clause of the Lay Protest, adopted at a meeting at Exeter, May 31, 1851.

² See a Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex, 12th and 13th May, 1851, by the Ven. J. Sinclair, M.A., Archdeacon of Middlesex and Vicar of Kensington. Rivingtons: London.

³ Aug. de Civ. Dei, xvi. 2.

Wall, in his "History of Infant Baptism," has proved, as you well know, that, from the beginning of the Church, infants were baptized, and, that the belief of their obtaining by that Sacrament remission of original sin, lay at the foundation of the Church's practice. He has collected abundant testimonies of the Fathers, who lived before the period of the Council of Constantinople, bearing upon this point. Let me only remind you of Origen's¹ words, "that, since the Baptism of the Church is "given for the remission of sins, and infants are, by the "Church's custom, baptized, the grace of baptism would seem "superfluous to such, if there were in them nothing requiring "mercy and forgiveness."

You will give its due weight also to the evidence of the Bishops of Africa, assembled in Council,² with S. Cyprian,³ and declaring by his mouth, that "Infants needed not to wait eight "days for baptism, as they did under the law for circumcision, "but should be admitted at once to the Grace of Christ in that "Sacrament, which, as it was given even to the greatest "offenders, on their penitence and faith, much less therefore "might a new-born infant be kept from baptism, 'qui ad remissionem peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod "illi remittuntur, non propria, sed aliena peccata.'"

But you will recollect also, and others, who have not read the 19th chapter of Wall's History, will refer with profit to it, to see how the discussions, which arose out of the Pelagian controversy, enable us confidently to assert, that, understanding "One Baptism for the Remission of Sins," to contain this among other truths, the remission of original sin to all infants by that sacrament, we are not adopting a novel interpretation, nor narrowing the limits of opinion, to exclude those who differ; but, that, so speaking, we use at this day no other language than S. Augustine employed, and cited the authority of the Catholic Church, for understanding it in the sense which I have mentioned.

The Pelagians, as is well known, denied original sin, yet they could not deny the baptism of infants. The weight of the whole Church was against their doing so. They could not deny some

¹ "Quid causæ sit, cum baptisma ecclesiæ in remissionem peccatorum detur, secundum ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari, cum utique si nihil esset in parvulis quod ad remissionem deberet et indulgentiam pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur." Hom. 8. in Levit. c. 12.

² A. D. 253.

³ Epist. 64, ad Fidum.

benefit of Christ, to infants; “premitur mole matris ecclesiæ,” (said S. Augustine)¹ to one whom he represents as forced into this acknowledgment. They could not deny the Church’s express words, “Baptism for the Remission of Sins,” nor its application to the case of infants. We confess (said Celestius)² “infantes “debere baptizari in remissionem peccatorum, secundum regulam “universalis ecclesiæ.” “Iisdem sacramenti verbis” (said Pelagius)³ “in infantibus, quibus etiam in majoribus, asserimus “baptisma esse celebrandum.”—Yes, with the same words, but he, and those who thought with him, while they held the Church’s words, put upon them a meaning of their own. They denied that this remission was of original sin, but, as some said, of actual sins;⁴ some, that they were baptized not for forgiveness, but to be sanctified in Christ;⁵ some, that it was to obtain them a place in the kingdom of heaven;⁶ with reference to a peculiar tenet held by them, respecting infants who died unbaptized.

Now it is against their using thus the Church’s solemn words, and imposing a different meaning on them, in order to conceal a denial of the Church’s truth, that S. Augustine had to contend, in this controversy. That original sin was the fault and corruption of the nature of every child of Adam,—that in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, remission of the guilt of such sin was, in deed and in truth, conferred upon infants; that such, and no other, was the meaning of the Church’s words, “Baptism for the Remission of Sins;”—these were the points pressed by him, and others, against this heresy, and pressed to a successful issue.

In the pursuit of this argument it is, that he so constantly urges the weight of Catholic consent, for the doctrine of original sin and its remission to infants in Holy Baptism.

“Dimitti hoc” (he is speaking of original sin) “lavacro regenerationis in parvulis, tantâ fidei Catholicæ antiquitate, atque “auctoritate firmatum, tam clarâ ecclesiæ celebritate notissimum, ut, quidquid contra hoc sit, verum esse non possit.”⁷

Speaking of the sense of certain texts, (Rom. v.) he says, they can have no other meaning than that, “per quem factum est, “ut antiquitus universa ecclesia retineret, fideles parvulos originalis peccati remissionem per Christi Baptismum consecutos.”⁸

¹ Aug. Ser. cxciv. c. 17.

² Aug. de Pec. Orig. c. 5.

³ Libell. Fid. Pelagii Aug. Op. x. Append. Par. ii.

⁴ Aug. de Pec. Mer. i. 34

⁵ Aug. de Pec. Mer. iii. vi. 12.

⁶ Aug. Serm. cxciv. Wall. Hist. Inf. Bapt. xix. 11.

⁷ Contra 2 Ep. Pel. iii. c. x.

⁸ De P. M. iii. c. 4.

It is in meeting the shifts and evasions of Pelagius, and his followers, that he pleads so earnestly for the truthfulness of the Church in her Baptism of infants for the remission of sins. Hence, his frequent expressions, that if Baptism did not confer this grace, the very form of the sacrament was "*falsa et fallax, in quâ sonaret, atque agi videretur, et tamen nulla fieret remissio peccatorum;*"¹ that, "so great a Sacrament was turned into a mere mockery, if infants were baptized into a Saviour's name, yet were not saved; redeemed by a Deliverer, yet not set free,—*lavacro regenerationis laventur, sed non abluantur.*"²

Hence, said Gelasius, writing against the same heretics, and feeling indignantly the dishonour done to God and his Church, by such insincerity as their doctrine implied—"That infants just born are baptized for the remission of sins, no Christian is ignorant; a Sacrament which the Church '*non fallaciter, sed veraciter celebrat, ne in sacramentis cœlestibus*' "*(quod absit) mentita videatur.*"³

Hence, lastly, the Council of Carthage⁴ strikes with its anathema such as said, "that infants were to be baptized for the remission of sins, yet derived no sin from Adam, to be cleansed by the Laver of Regeneration; whence it would follow, that in their case, '*forma baptismatis in remissionem peccatorum, non vera, sed falsa intelligatur.*'"⁵

For, say the 214 Bishops then assembled, referring to the Apostle's words, (Rom. v.) "they must be understood in no other sense than that in which the Catholic Church, spread over all the world, has understood them, '*propter enim hanc regulam fidei, etiam parvuli qui nihil peccatorum in semet-ipsis adhuc committere potuerunt, ideo in peccatorum remissionem veraciter baptizantur, ut in eis regeneratione mundetur, quod generatione traxerunt.*'"

Lastly, to complete the evidence, that the true doctrine in this case was witnessed by the Creed, and that the Article, "one Baptism for the Remission of Sins," was *then* the firmest bulwark against error, as, I trust, it will be found to be so *now*, S. Jerome, in his Dialogues against the Pelagians, closes his discourse in these words:—

¹ De P. M. i. c. xxxiv. 63.

² Cont. Jul. iii. c. v.—11.

³ Gel. Epist. ad Epis. per Pic. 5. apud Aug. Opp. x. App. p. 2.

⁴ A. D. 418.

⁵ Conc. Af. Un. c. 2.

“Hoc unum dicam, ut tandem finiatur oratio; aut novum vos debere Symbolum tradere, ut post Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, baptizentur infantes in regnum cœlorum,” (which I observed above was a peculiar opinion held by some of this party,) “aut, si unum, et in parvulis, et in magnis, habetis baptismam, etiam infantes in remissionem peccatorum baptizandos in similitudinem prævaricationis Adam.”¹

They must either reject the Creed and propound a new one, or give up their own opinion, which was thus proved to be inconsistent with it.²

Now let it be calmly considered whether the Article of the Creed which we hold at this day, “I acknowledge one Baptism for the Remission of Sins,” did not in the times of the Pelagian controversy, to which I have referred, bear the sense throughout the Catholic Church of Christ, in which SS. Jerome and Augustine understood it,—whether they, who held it in its integrity, did not declare by it their belief, that remission of original sin was given in Holy Baptism to all infants. Let it be judged how, if I hold this Article in the same sense now, I can hold with it the doctrine that original sin in itself is such a hindrance to worthy reception of Baptism, that infants cannot receive benefit by that Sacrament, except a prevenient act of grace (of which man can know nothing) shall have made them worthy.

Should I so hold, and teach, would not the argument of S. Jerome have great force,—“Aut novum debes Symbolum tradere?”—either must you propound a new Creed, and hold one Baptism for the acknowledgment, or manifestation, of grace before given, or, you must confess, “One Baptism for the Remission of Sins,” and let the weight of the authority of the Catholic Church of Christ prevail against you.

But, it is said, the earlier, shorter forms of faith, the Roman, or Apostles’ Creed, and others, mention nothing of Baptism, but the forgiveness of sins only: “I believe the forgiveness of sins.” In a Creed preserved by Epiphanius,³ it is, “I believe one Baptism of repentance,” as if remission of sins were connected, not with Baptism, but with repentance.

But let Bishop Pearson say if this is so indeed. In his inquiry how this remission of sins is conferred upon any person

¹ Wall’s Hist. of Inf. Bapt. c. xix. 26.

² For a more full account of the bearing of the questions which arose out of the Pelagian controversy upon the Article of the Creed referred to in this Sermon, see Dr. Pusey on the Royal Supremacy, postscript, pp. 230—247.

³ Bingham, Antiq. of the Chr. Church, x. c. iv. s. 15.

in the Church, "With respect to the initiation of a Christian," saith he,¹ "it is the most general and irrefragable assertion of all, to whom we have reason to give credit, that all sins whatsoever any person is guilty of, are remitted in the Baptism of the same person. S. Peter made this the exhortation of his first sermon: 'Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins.' In vain," adds Bishop Pearson, "doth doubting and fluctuating Socinus endeavour to evacuate the evidence of this Scripture, attributing the remission either to repentance without consideration of Baptism, or else to the public profession of faith made in Baptism, or, if anything must be attributed to Baptism itself, it must be nothing but a declaration of such remission."

"Vel baptismo," (are the words of Socinus himself,) "hoc est, ablutioni, nequaquam peccatorum remissionem tribuit Petrus, sed pœnitentiæ; vel, si baptismi quoque rationem eâ in re habuit, aut, quatenus publicam nominis Jesu Christi professionem continet, eam tantum consideravit; aut, si ipsius etiam externæ ablutionis omnino rationem habere voluit, quod ad ipsam attinet, remissionis peccatorum nomine, non ipsam remissionem verè, sed remissionis declarationem, et obligationem quandam intellexit."

Are we not strangely reminded by this passage, Brethren, of the "*falsa et fallax forma*," which S. Augustine told us the Pelagian opinion gave to Holy Baptism; "in quâ sonaret, atque agi videretur, et tamen nulla fieret remissio peccatorum?" and of those strong words of Gelasius, shrinking with horror from the thought that the Church of Christ could play the liar in heavenly Sacraments?²

Yet, here is "doubting and fluctuating" Socinus making the Church a liar, and God's own word of none effect, through his false gloss, like those juggling fiends spoken of by our great poet,

"Who palter with us in a double sense,
And keep the word of promise to the ear,
But break it to our hope."

There is an error, which some, in jealousy for the truth of Christ's pure Gospel, would avoid,—the "*opus operatum*"

¹ Pearson on the Creed; Art. Forgiveness of Sins.

² Vide supra, p. 17. Quæ non fallaciter, sed veraciter celebrat Ecclesia, ne in sacramentis cœlestibus (quod absit) mentita videatur.

doctrine, as they esteem it, of the Sacraments. Here Bishop Pearson has warned us of a rock on the other side, upon which whosoever strikes must make utter shipwreck of the faith indeed! The degradation of the Sacraments is the first step in the downward course to the Socinian heresy—the *ἀρνησιθεὸς ἀποστασία*¹—one of the forms of Antichrist, as S. John has warned us.²

We need not—shame, deep shame to us, who have a lawful ministry, the Catholic Faith, the “form of sound words,” the “precious deposit” of the faith, delivered at the beginning; who have the pure Word of God and the Holy Sacraments ministered amongst us in all things according to Christ’s ordinance,—shame, I say, deep shame to us, if we desert our Mother Church, especially in her hour of need, and go over to the camp of her bitterest adversary;—no, we need not, with Rome, unduly exalt the Sacraments; but, above all things, brethren, let us not, with “doubting and fluctuating” Socinus, degrade, and empty them of their grace, which Christ, the Fountain of Grace, has, in and by them, promised to bestow.

Once more let me ask you, let me ask those who, in appearance, perhaps, and not in reality, are adversaries in this cause, calmly to weigh all that has been said; and judge, whether, at this time, an affirmation of the Article of the Creed of which I have been speaking, be altogether superfluous, or no; and if it be not, whether we may not to-day—our Bishop with his clergy—meet, and deliberate on what surely pertains to our office and ministry in the Church of God, without displeasing our Lord and Head, without violation of duty to our gracious Sovereign, without fear of—what we have been warned against, in no unkindly spirit, let us hope—without fear of fine or of imprisonment.

And now, brethren, let us pass from these subjects, which, of necessity, bear on them the character of contention;—unblamable contention, I trust, since it is for the faith’s sake;—and let us conclude with other thoughts,—thoughts of peace and love, reverence and devotion, prayer and intercession.

One word there is in our text, which you must have observed that I have passed by, but only that it might be the last spoken of, and leave its own sweet influence, fragrant as the incense from the golden altar, upon us all.

¹ Euseb. Eccl. Hist. 5. 28.

² 1 John ii. 18—26; iv. 1—6; v. 20, 21.

“Hold fast the form of sound words,” but, hold it, said S. Paul, “in LOVE, which is in Christ Jesus.” Love, which draws us unto Him who was crucified for us, Who is our Life, and Hope,—Love, which binds us unto one another for His sake, in obedience to His word, as members together of His body, joint-partakers of His Holy Spirit,—Love, which is the only healer of all breaches, without which, the eloquence of angels would be a tinkling cymbal;—faith, that could move mountains, of no account;—nay, the giving even of the body to the flames would be a bootless sacrifice.¹

Let us draw near unto our Lord, in His own holy ordinance, and, having in remembrance His exceeding great love to us, let us with united, fervent intercession, beseech Him to pour out upon His Church His Holy Spirit of light and love; to² “take away” from us all hatred, and prejudice, and whatsoever else may “hinder us from godly union and concord; that, as there is but “one body, and one Spirit, and one hope of our calling; one Lord, “one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of us all; so we may “henceforth be all of one heart, and one soul; united in one “holy bond of truth, and peace; of faith, and charity; and “may, with one mind and one mouth, glorify God—through “Him, our only Saviour, and Redeemer; to whom, with the “Father, and the Holy Ghost, be all honour, and glory, and “praise, and thanksgiving, now, and for ever.” Amen.

After the Sermon the Holy Communion was celebrated; and then the Bishop with the Clergy proceeded to the Chapter House.

PRESENT,

Mr. Ralph Barnes, Registrar.
Rev. William Scott, Secretary to the
Bishop.

John Bartholomew, Archdeacon of Barn-
staple.

Richard Stephens, Subdean.

Richard Ellicombe.

Robert Holdsworth.

James Duke Coleridge, D.D.

George Hole.

Peter Johnson.

Charles Lyne.

Richard Laney.

Henry Woollcombe.

Robert Scott.

Joseph Dornford.

James Ford.

Nutcombe Oxenham.

THE CLERGY.

*Dignitaries and Prebendaries of the
Cathedral.*

Edward Charles Harington, Chancellor
of the Church.

John Moore Stevens, Archdeacon of
Exeter.

Robert Hurrell Froude, Archdeacon of
Totnes.

¹ 1 Cor. xiii. 3.

² “Prayer for Unity.” The Service for the Accession of Her Majesty.

Bishop's Chaplains.

Edward Copleston Phillpotts, R. Lezant.
 Francis Du Boulay, R. Lawhitton.
 Thomas Phillpotts, V. St. Feock.
 James Buller Kitson, V. Pelynt.
 Robert Baker Carew, R. Bickleigh.

Officials of the Archdeacons.

Henry Nicholls, V. Rockbeare, Exeter.
 Richard Champernowne, C. Dartington,
 Totnes.

ARCHDEACONRY OF EXETER.

Deanery of Christianity.

Joseph Corfe, R. St. Petrock, Exeter, D.
 Christopher Churchill Bartholomew,
 P. C. St. David, Exeter.
 Philip Carlyon, P.C. St. James, Exeter.

Deanery of Tiverton.

John Wollaston Karslake, V. Culmstock.
 Thomas Hopkins Britton, C. Hock-
 worthy.

Deanery of Honiton.

Robert William James, R. Southleigh, D.
 Thomas Henry Marker, R. Gittisham.
 John Gay Copleston, R. Offwell.

Deanery of Dunkeswell.

Henry Tippetts Tucker, R. Clayhidon, D.
 Henry Edwards, Junr. R. Churchstanton.

Deanery of Aylesbeare.

Henry Sanders, R. Sowton, D.
 Sidney William Cornish, D.D. V. Ottery
 St. Mary.
 Henry Martyn Lower, C. Sidmouth.

Deanery of Cudbury.

Nicholas Francis Lightfoot, V. Cadbury,
 D.
 Wm. Tucker Arundell Radford, R. Down
 St. Mary.
 Robert Augustus Knox, C. Shobrooke.

Deanery of Dunsford.

Richard Stephens, V. Dunsford, D.
 William Mallock, R. Cheriton Bishop.
 Charles Burne, Junr. C. Tedburne St.
 Mary.

Deanery of Kenn.

Henry Palk, R. Dunchideock and Shil-
 lingford, D.
 Hon. Henry Hugh Courtenay, R. Mam-
 head.
 Frederick Salter, C. East Teignmouth.

Deanery of Plymtree.

Alexander Rhind Webster, P.C. Brad-
 ninch, D.

ARCHDEACONRY OF TOTNES.

Deanery of Totnes.

Henry Hare, P.C. Halwell, D.
 William Cooper Johnson, R. Diptford.
 William Burrough Cosens, V. Berry
 Pomeroy.

Deanery of Woodleigh.

George Dawson, R. Woodleigh, D.
 Thomas Twysden, R. Charleton.
 Robert Henry Fortescue, C. Bigbury.

Deanery of Ipplepen.

John Nutcombe Gould, R. Stokeinteign-
 head, D.
 Joseph Hemington Harris, D.D., P.C.
 Tormohun.
 John Roughton Hogg, Inc. Lower Brix-
 ham.

Deanery of Moreton.

Frederick Ensor, R. Lustleigh, D.
 Hon. Charles Leslie Courtenay, V.
 Bovey Tracey.
 William Marsh, V. Ashburton.

Deanery of Okehampton.

John Downall, V. Okehampton, D.
 Nathaniel John Brassey Hole, R. Broad-
 woodkelly.
 George Henry Fothergill, R. Belstone.

Deanery of Tavistock.

Hinds Howell, V. Bridestowe, D.
 Edward Carlyon, V. Lamerton.
 Thomas Gibbons, C. Tavistock.

Deanery of Tamerton.

David Smith Stone, R. Walkhampton, D.
 John Abbott, R. Meavy.
 Antony Buller, R. St. Mary Tavy.

Deanery of Plympton.

John May, V. Ugborough, D.
 John Yonge, R. Newton Ferrers.
 John Allen, R. North Huish.

ARCHDEACONRY OF BARNSTAPLE.

Deanery of Barnstaple.

James Pycroft, Inc. St. Mary Magdalene,
 Barnstaple, D.
 Dashwood Lang, V. Westleigh.
 James Arthur, R. Atherington.

Deanery of Southmolton.

William Thorold, R. Warkleigh, D.
 William Heberden Karslake, R. Meshaw.
 Comyns Tucker, R. Washford Pyne.

Deanery of Chulmleigh.

George Stone, R. Bondleigh, D.
James Smith Townsend, V. Coleridge.
Pelham Fellowes Clay, R. Eggesford.

Deanery of Sherwill.

Matthew Mundy, P. C. Lynton and
Countisbury.
John Mill Chanter, V. Ilfracombe.

Deanery of Great Torrington.

James Cory Kempe, R. Merton, D.
William Walter Gurney, R. Roborough.
William Karslake, R. Dolton.

Deanery of Hartland.

Francis Wolferstan Thomas, R. Park-
ham, D.
Isaac Henry Gosset, V. Northam.
John Thomas Pine Coffin, R. Alwington.

Deanery of Holsworthy.

John Carslake Duncan Yule, R. Brad-
ford, D.
Francis Brooking Briggs, R. Sutcombe.
Wm. Dyer Anderson, C. Holsworthy.

—
ARCHDEACONRY OF CORNWALL.
—*Deanery of Trigg Minor.**Deanery of Trigg Major.*

Phillipps Donnythorne Dayman, V.
Poundstock, D.

Walter Gee, R. Week St. Mary.
William Frederick Everest, P. C. Lan-
east.

Deanery of East.

Reginald Hobhouse, R. St. Ive, D.
Richard Martin, V. Menhenniot.
Francis Edward Baston Cole, C. Pil-
laton.

Deanery of West.

Arthur Tatham, R. Bocconnock, D.
Richard Buller, R. Lanreath.
John Hawkins Hext, V. Morval.

Deanery of Kerrier.

Edward Griffith, V. Manaccan, D.
Gregory Birch Boraston, V. Wendron.
William Rogers, R. Mawnan.

Deanery of Penwith.

John White Johns, V. Crowan, D.
Uriah Tonkin, V. Lelant.
Michael Nowell Peters, V. Madron.

Deanery of Powder.

Francis John Hext Kendall, V. Lanli-
very, D.
Richard William Barnes, V. Probus.

Deanery of Pyder.

Hugh Henry Molesworth, R. Little
Petherick, D.
Edward Dix, V. St. Newlyn.
Samuel Masterson Walker, V. St. Enoder.

PRAYERS SAID AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE SYNOD.

BISHOP : Let us Pray.

O LORD JESUS CHRIST, who hast promised in Thy Holy Word, that where two or three are gathered together in Thy Name, Thou wilt vouchsafe to be present in the midst of them; be Thou graciously present, Lord, we beseech Thee, with us Thy ministers, and enlighten us by Thy Grace. *Amen.*

Grant, that walking in watchful care before Thee, we may discern the true teaching of Thy holy Apostles, and that all our words may be according to the Faith once delivered to the Saints. *Amen.*

Grant to us, Lord, we pray Thee, a right judgment in all things pertaining to Thy Church and to the duties of our sacred Ministry therein; especially grant that we may have grace and strength to speak Thy Word with all faithful boldness. *Amen.*

Grant that seeking Truth and Peace, we may so minister to the Peace of Thy Church, that we, with all Thy faithful People, and especially those committed to our charge, may have the Peace of God evermore ruling in our hearts. *Amen.*

Then the Bishop standing up said,

ALMIGHTY GOD, who in the beginning of the Gospel did cause the Apostles and Elders to meet together, and did endow them with His Holy Spirit, grant unto us all, who are here assembled, we humbly trust by His Providence, the Spirit of Wisdom, and of Love, and of a sound mind, that He may accomplish by us whatever work He hath appointed for us, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

ACTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE SYNOD.

SESSION I. Wednesday, June 25th.

The Clergy being seated, the Bishop addressed the Synod as follows :—

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,—You will readily believe that I am not now able, even if I were desirous, to say much to you. There are feelings on such an occasion as this, of which I will only say, that I should be very sorry indeed, if they were not strong enough within me, to weaken my powers of addressing you.

Let me first thank you most heartily for your attendance here this day. Having said this, I will briefly state why I have thought it fit to call you together. I feel, as I am sure you all feel, how great are the perplexities of our present position in this Church. A bishop cannot but feel those perplexities—I will not say more strongly than the most earnest of those who are ministers of our Church—but as strongly as any of them, upon general grounds; and he has, moreover, an additional ground of anxiety and care. He has special duties incumbent on him which are at the present season almost overpowering. Under the pressure of these difficulties, it is for him earnestly to have recourse to all the ways by which he can, with God's blessing, best inform himself of his duty; as well as, by prayer offered up to God, acquire strength and grace, in whatever measure, to perform it. Now, among the means by which I may inform myself, I know of none so effectual, none so powerful, as that of communicating freely, and from my heart, with the hearts and understandings of my Clergy. We have all a common ministry—differing in some respects, differing in the particulars of action which belong to our respective orders—but all that is greatest we have in common. And when I look around me—when I consider whom I have here this day—when I remember, too, whom I have *heard* this day, I cannot but feel that my weak faculties may receive very, very powerful help from yours.

Therefore it is that I have called you together; and I rejoice to think, that if I have been right in calling you here—and my heart as well as my judgment tells me that I have been right—I rejoice, I say, to think that I am thereby testifying my own sense of the importance of the Presbyterate in the conduct and guidance of the Church—and am doing what one humble individual can do to recognise the power of the Presbyters. I do fully recognise it, and, with God's blessing, will be ready upon all occasions to set it forth. We are met together in Diocesan Synod this day—met for important purposes—met, that you may be asked, especially, whether you advise me to put forth, as the act of this Synod, certain declarations on most grave subjects. The first of these, on a matter most interesting to the Church of Christ, you have all had submitted to you, and you are all, I doubt not, prepared to pronounce your judgment upon it. Yet there are a few observations which I would wish previously to lay before you, and which, presuming that I might be less able than usual to address you extempore, I have thought it better to commit to writing.

Diocesan Synods are the most ancient of all Synods, after the Apostolical.

White Kennett, in his “Ecclesiastical Synods,” says at p. 198,—
 “The next Synods were *Diocesan*. For, after the destruction of Jerusalem, at least, all Bishops were of equal character, and had within their own respective districts the separate care of Church affairs. So that every *Diocese* was an absolute *Church* within itself, and had full authority over its own members. So, as the Bishop and his colleagues, who were *select Presbyters*, held their peculiar Synods.”

“From the time that Church Government was here established, I believe our Bishops had the right of calling their own Clergy to a Synod, and to enter upon debates, and draw up Rules,” &c. p. 200.

This right appears to have been constantly exercised according to the judgment of the Bishop in convoking his Clergy. That *Diocesan Synods* did not necessarily imply, that *all* the Clergy were summoned to meet, is apparent from what has just been cited from *Kennett*, respecting select Presbyters:—but it is still more apparent from an actual instance of a *Diocesan Synod*, to be found in *Wilkins's Concilia*, i. p. 369,—“Acta Synodi apud Wigorniam a S. Wlstando habitæ, anno 1092.”

“ Ego Wlstanus, gratia Dei Wigorniensis Episcopus, decrevi
 ‘ ‘ Synodum congregare in Monasterio S. Mariæ in criptis
 “ Hæc Synodus habita est anno 1092. Ad hanc Synodum *invi-*
tati conuenerunt omnes sapientissimæ personæ de tribus comitati-
 “ bus nostræ Diœceseos,” &c.

This practice of *not* calling together *all* the Clergy of the Diocese to the Diocesan Synod, is recognised by the most celebrated Professor of Civil Law, at the time of the Reformation, in the middle of the 16th century, *Franciscus Duarenus*, who in his great work “*De Sacris Ecclesiæ Ministeriis et Beneficiis*,” l. i. c. 11, thus says: “*Tametsi solenne ordinariumque sit, Sacerdotes qui Ecclesias regunt ad Synodum convocare, non etiam cæteros clericos et Archimandritas, seu Monasteriorum Præsules: tamen si justa aliqua causa Episcopum moveat, his etiam mandare potest, ut ad Synodum accedant,*” thus recognising the right of the Bishop to require the attendance of all, but recognising also his right to exercise his discretion.

In small Dioceses, it seems to have been very usual to summon all: yet this is not without exception. For, it appears by an instance given in Wilkins, iv. 228, that in the year 1561, a “*Diocesan Synod*,” expressly so called, was celebrated by Thomas Davies, Bishop of St. Asaph, to which the Clergy of a single Deanry was summoned.

“*Concilium Diœcesanum Assaphense celebratum in Ecclesiâ Cathedrali Assaphensi a Thomâ Episcopo Assaphen. die Mercurii 12. Novembris: Quibus die et loco Reverendus Pater Dom. Thomas, Assaph. Episcopus, convocato coram eo Clero Decanatûs de Rose, statuit, ordinavit,*” &c. Whereas, so late as in 1683, a Diocesan Synod of the whole of the Clergy of that small Diocese is recorded in Wilkins, iv. 608.

In the larger Diocese of Norwich (which was indeed a Diocese containing more Clergymen than almost any other in England) the Diocesan Synod was held annually; and Dean Prideaux (in his *Directions to Churchwardens*, p. 178) says:—“*Diocesan Synods were kept up in the Diocese of Norwich, and all the Clergy of the Diocese constantly attended at them every year: that is, the Clergy of Suffolk at Ipswich, and the Clergy of Norfolk at Norwich.*” This lasted to the time of the Great Rebellion in 1641.

These cases sufficiently show, that it is not necessary that all the Clergy be actually brought together, in order to constitute

a Diocesan Synod; but that all be consulted and advised with, in such manner as the Bishop should deem best: for a Diocesan Synod is the Bishop consulting his Clergy. Accordingly, Archbishop Usher, in his "Reduction of Episcopacy unto the Form of Synodical Government received in the ancient Church," proposes that in the Diocesan Synod all the Rectors and Incumbent Pastors (or *a certain select number* of them from every Deanery in the Diocese) might meet under the Bishop.

The Bishop, in ancient times, had his Clergy residing with him in his cathedral, and these urban Clergy were his Council. These were succeeded by Deans and Chapters, who were the Councils of the Bishop; and the meetings of Bishops with these Councils seem to have been sometimes called Diocesan Synods.

In Henry VIII.'s time, when the appointment of the members of the new Chapters was, in great part, assumed by the Crown, these Capitular Councils seem to have ceased.

Now, the present Synod fulfils the condition of the Bishop's consulting the whole body of his Clergy, in as perfect a manner as is possible. For, not only are the Dean and Chapter members *ex officio* of the Synod, but also there are representatives of every Deanery of the Diocese, the Clergy of which have been ready to send representatives to it; and of the thirty-two Deaneries, into which the Diocese is divided, thirty have actually chosen representatives.

But more than this; all the Clergy, in their respective Deaneries, have been consulted on every particular which is to be brought before the Synod for its consideration; and the observations which every one of them might wish to make on one main particular, have been already sought and duly weighed. It is impossible, therefore, to devise a more perfect mode of obtaining the judgment of the Clergy at large, and of every individual, than is afforded by the constitution of this Synod, and by the course adopted in respect to it. To call a Synod of all the Clergy, in a Diocese so large as this, would be, in effect, to throw the whole power into the hands of those who are nearest to the place where the Synod might be holden.

That the voices of its members are *free*, I need not say: but yet I will say, that in no one single instance have I expressed even a wish for the election, or non-election, of any individual—much as I rejoice at the election of all of those whom I see before me.

In a word, I rest the question of the fitness of making an election of those who attend the Synod, on this simple issue:—

If, as we have seen, a Bishop of Worcester had, and exercised, the right of inviting to a Synod those whom he himself judged “the *wisest*” of the Clergy of the three counties comprised within his Diocese, can it be wrong for the Bishop of another Diocese to invite all his Clergy to select from among themselves in their several Deaneries, those whom they shall judge the wisest and the fittest to convey their counsel to their Bishop on the points on which he seeks that counsel?

I have hitherto said nothing of the fancied, or pretended, illegality of Diocesan Synods.

These Synods are almost as old as the Church itself—older than the union of the Church with the State; but it is most remarkable, in connexion with the question of the legality of such Synods, that at no time, and in no country, has the temporal law interfered with them by any enactment whatever. This is especially the case in our own country. Even the Statute of 25 H. VIII. c. 19, which forbade the holding National or Provincial Synods without the consent of the Crown, did yet not forbid the holding of Diocesan Synods, which were, and always had been, called by the Bishops on their sole authority.

In the “*Reformatio Legum*,” a work completed in 1551, and avowedly drawn up, mainly, as a compilation of the ancient Canon Law of England, by commissioners appointed under the authority of that Statute itself, Diocesan Synods are treated as a well-known institution in every Diocese, and the continuance of them is there prescribed. Their actual continuance in the reign of Queen Elizabeth is recognised by letters of the Council to the several Bishops, especially by one¹ of the date of 1573, subscribed by the Lord Burghley, and others his fellows, calling on the Bishops “in their Visitations and *Synods*” “to keep all churches in their Dioceses in one uniform and godly order.”

Again, the 119th Canon of 1603, with equal explicitness, speaks of diocesan “Visitations and *Synods*” as matters equally notorious.

Of the entire lawfulness, indeed, of our Synod there ought not to be a doubt, since the first Minister of Her Majesty,

¹ Cardwell's Doc. Ann. No. LXXX.

speaking on the authority of the law officers of the Crown, has declared them to be lawful; however, ignorant and presumptuous agitators may scruple not, in spite of this declaration, to affect to regard them as unlawful.

Having said so much of the Synod itself, I will now proceed to the first particular of the special business before us—to the proposed declaration of our adherence to the Article of the Nicene Creed, “I acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins.”

But here, in the outset, we are met by certain statements, which, whatever we may think of them, seem to require some notice, because of the respectable authority which has put them forth. The Archdeacon of Middlesex, in a recent Charge to his Clergy, has said what follows:—

“On examining the history of the Council of Constantinople, we find that . . . *the* question before the Council was, whether Baptism should be repeated in the case of persons who had been baptized by heretics or schismatics . . . S. Basil had shortly before asserted . . . that baptism by heretics or schismatics was absolutely void, and that the sacrament in such cases ought to be repeated. His opinions were disapproved by the Council, and the seventh Canon was enacted, making this addition to the Nicene Creed. The assembled Fathers objected to the repetition of baptism” . . . “S. Epiphanius, in the longer of the two forms in which he gives the Creed, says merely, ‘I believe one baptism of repentance,’ omitting all reference to remission of sins.”

This is not an occasion for going into a detailed consideration of these statements. It is enough for the present purpose, to notice two or three of the principal. One is, that the Fathers at Constantinople took occasion to “condemn an opinion, recently put forth by S. Basil, that baptism by heretics or schismatics was absolutely void:” and that, on this account, “the seventh Canon was enacted, making this addition to the Creed.”

Now, in the first place, whoever will take the trouble to look into the seventh Canon, will see that it does not make this or any other addition to the Creed. It simply prescribes respecting different heretics, which of them shall be received into the Church by chrism—and *which*, as heathens, by baptism: and Fleury (Ecc. Hist. l. xviii. n. 7) says, that “these were the

“same, and of the same country, with those whom S. Basil mentions in his first Canonical Epistle to S. Amphilochius, “and whose baptism he declares invalid:”—so that the Canon, which the learned Archdeacon assures us was enacted to *condemn* the doctrine of S. Basil, was, in truth, strictly *conformed to that doctrine*.

But, in the second place, the Canon itself is treated by Bishop Beveridge, and other of the most learned in ecclesiastical antiquities, as undoubtedly spurious.

Another assertion is, that “the assembled Fathers had objected to the repetition of this sacrament.” “This was *the* question.”

Where and how does this appear? Not in the Acts, not in their Synodal Epistle to the Emperor Theodosius, or in the Synodical Address of Nectarius to the Council. It is not noticed by the almost contemporary historians, Socrates, Sozomen, or Theodoret; in none of the copious Commentaries of Balsamon or Zonaras. Where then, we may be permitted to ask, did the Archdeacon find the fact which he has stated?

But this is not all. The Article “One Baptism,” &c. which the Archdeacon assures us was introduced by the Fathers at Constantinople, to condemn an opinion recently put forth by S. Basil, is proved by Bishop Bull (Jud. Ecc. Cath. vi. 4—10)¹ to have been in the most ancient Creeds of the East, long before the time of the Council of Constantinople, or even that of Nice; having been directed against heresies of the second century, of which Gregory of Nazianzum, (Orat. 23, al. 25,) one of the Fathers at the Council of Constantinople, testifies, that they had then totally disappeared.

There remains a statement of the Archdeacon far more painful than any of the preceding. His words are these:—“That the question before the Council of Constantinople,

¹ Bishop Bull's words are as follow, n. 6:—“Quæ in Symbolo Hierosolymitano subjiciuntur post ista ‘in Spiritum Sanctum,’ ex Symbolo Constantinopolitano minime desumpta, sed in antiquissimis Orientis Symbolis, diu ante Synodum Constantinopolitanam adeoque Nicænam, posita fuisse, validissimis argumentis confirmabo.”—(Bull's Works: Oxford, 1827. vol. vi. p. 138.) The last of his statements is in these words:—“Quæ sequuntur in Symbolo Hierosolymitano post verba ‘Et in Spiritum Sanctum,’ hæreses quasdam manifeste feriunt, quæ maxime *secundo sæculo* Ecclesiam Christi, præsertim in Oriente, turbarunt: quæque tempore Synodi Constantinopolitanæ, et multo aute consopitæ fuerunt; *absurdum est igitur statuere, ista tunc temporis orientali Symbolo addita fuisse*. Hæreses volo Simonis, Menandri, Cerinthi et aliorum, qui Gnosticorum nomine comprehendi solent; quas Gregorius Nazianzenus, qui tempore Concilii Constantinopolitani et ante ipsum floruit, jam sua ætate pridem evanuisse testatur.”—lb. pp. 142, 143.

“did not relate to the efficacy of Baptism, but to the propriety of repeating *that initiatory ordinance* in certain cases, “is still more evident from *another fact* not sufficiently “attended to. In the creeds of various churches, the article “is expressed in such a manner as absolutely to *exclude all “reference to the efficacy of Baptism.* St. Cyril of Jerusalem, “recording the creed of that Church, the mother of all “churches, speaks of ‘one Baptism of *Repentance* for the “‘remission of sins,’ thus *connecting* the remission of sins, not “*with Baptism, but with repentance.*” (How correctly this is spoken of S. Cyril, will be seen from the passages which I shall presently cite from the very work in which the Archdeacon finds his authority for this assertion.) But he proceeds:—“St. Epiphanius also, in the longer of the forms in which he gives the “Creed, says merely, ‘I believe one Baptism of repentance,’ “*omitting all reference to remission of sins.*”

This is very true; but the Charge ought to have told those who heard it, that the very same Father, in the shorter¹ of the two forms (both of which were, it appears, present to the eyes of the writer), actually gives this Article in the very same form in which it appears in our own Creed, ‘Ὁμολογοῦμεν ἐν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν—“We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins,” *without any reference to repentance,* thus absolutely annihilating the Archdeacon’s very foundation.

But the Archdeacon further says, that “in the Council of “Constantinople we see no allusion whatever to Infant Baptism.” It may well be, that there was no allusion to the specific case of Baptism of infants. But the real question is, whether the Fathers, who inserted this Article into their Creed, maintained such doctrine respecting the Grace of Baptism, as implies that this grace is always conferred on all fit recipients (among whom it is not pretended that infants are not included) in and by this Sacrament.

Now, of the Fathers who were present in the Council of Constantinople, there are four (and I believe only four) whose writings have come down to us, S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Gregory of Nazianzum, S. Gregory of Nyssa, and S. Amphilochius of Iconium. I will adduce some short extracts from the writings of every one of them on the efficacy of Baptism, and its necessity to salvation.

¹ Epiphan. Ancorat. 120.

The first is S. Cyril of Jerusalem, whose chief work, cited as we have just seen, by the Archdeacon as an express authority for "connecting the remission of sins, not with Baptism, but with repentance," is a series of Catechetical Lectures for the instruction of Adult Candidates for Baptism. In such a work, it cannot be expected that we shall find any express declaration respecting the Baptism of infants. It is enough if the principles therein stated imply that the grace is given in Baptism to infants, who are confessedly fit recipients thereof.

In his first, or Introductory, Lecture, he says:—"The Bath of Baptism we may not receive twice or thrice, for there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism: none but Heretics are rebaptized, since *their former Baptism was not Baptism*."—Introduct. Lect. n. 7.

Now, upon this, it is obvious to remark, that it is quite inconsistent with the notion, which we have just considered, that this Article was introduced into the Creed, for the purpose of *condemning* the doctrine *that the Baptism of Heretics was not Baptism*. That doctrine, we see, is in terms affirmed by S. Cyril; though doubtless he understood it, and wished that he should himself be understood, with due exceptions.

But he proceeds:—"Great indeed is the Baptism which is offered to you. It is a ransom to captives, remission of offences, the death of sin, regeneration of the soul, garment of light, the holy seal indissoluble; the chariot to heaven; the delight of Paradise; the grant of the kingdom; the gift of adoption."—Ib. 16.

Again:—"Glorious was he who baptized with water, but what to Him who baptizeth with the Holy Ghost and with fire?"—Lect. iii. 9. "Unless a man receive Baptism, he hath not salvation."—Ib. 10. "By Baptism the sting of death is destroyed."—Ib. 11. "Now then, when thou art about to descend into the waters, consider not the bare element; look for its saving power by the operation of the Holy Ghost; for, without the two, thou canst not be made perfect. This is not my word, but the Lord Jesus Christ's, who has the power to do it; He saith, 'Except a man' [*ἐὰν μὴ τις*—does not this include Infants?] 'be born again,' and he enlargeth, 'of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.'"—Lect. iii. 4. "Believe in the Holy Ghost, who even now, at the season of Baptism, sealeth thy soul."—Ib. iv. 16.

I might multiply similar citations from S. Cyril; but these shall suffice. I proceed to Gregory of Nazianzum. He says:—"Baptism is casting off the flesh, a following of the Spirit, communion of the Word (Λογού κοινωνία), the creature's restoration to rectitude, sin's deluge, (κατακλυσμὸς ἁμαρτίας), illumination, a chariot to God, union with Christ "in His pilgrimage, the key of the kingdom of heaven."—Orat. 40. 3.

Again: "This the heavens congratulate; angels magnify for its kindred brightness; this is the image of the blessedness there [*i.e.* in heaven]; this we desire to praise, but cannot, as it is worthy."—Ib. 4. "This is the grace and power of Baptism, conveying, not a deluge of the world, as formerly, but a cleansing of the sins of each, and an entire ablution of all the obstructions and defilements by sin."—Ib. 7. "Cleansing the inmost parts, which, coming in aid of our first birth, maketh us new, instead of old; godlike, instead of beings for a time."—Ib. 8.

Can we, after this, doubt whether "the remission of sins" was not the chief point intended by these Fathers in their new Article?

But I must add one more passage from this Father: "Hast thou an infant? Give not opportunity to evil. Let him be sanctified from a babe. From his tenderest infancy let him be consecrated to the Spirit. Fearest thou the seal, on account of the infirmity of nature? O poor-spirited mother, and of little faith! Thou needest not amulets and charms for him, wherewith the evil one enters in. Give to him *the Trinity*, the one great and glorious phylactery—δὸς αὐτῷ τὴν Τριάδα, τὸ μέγα καὶ καλὸν φυλακτήριον."

After this, can any one gravely say, or expect to be gravely heard if he says, that Infant Baptism was not in the contemplation of the Fathers at Constantinople?

I turn to the other Gregory, of Nyssa: but I will be brief in my citations from him. "Baptism," says he, "is purging of sins, remission of trespasses, cause of renewal, and regeneration —of regeneration, to be contemplated with the mind's eye—it cannot be seen with that of the body. This benefit is bestowed, not by the water (for then would water be more exalted than all creation besides), but by the ordinance of God, and by the descent of the Spirit, mystically [that is, sacramentally] coming to our deliverance." "Except a man be

“born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” “The Spirit bloweth where it listeth, and thou canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth.” “It blesseth the body which is baptized, and the water which baptizeth.” “If any man persist in troubling me with questions, how is regeneration brought about by the water, and the mystical work wrought in it, my very reasonable answer is, “Make clear to me the mode of the generation after the flesh, and I will explain to thee the power which worketh regeneration as to the soul.”—S. Greg. Nyss. in Bapt. Christi, t. iii. pp. 368, 371.

I conclude with one extract from S. Amphilochius, the fourth of these Fathers. In his tract “In Domini Circumcisione,” (pp. 13, 15,) he says, “Jesus was circumcised, according to his own law, on the eighth day, not to teach men to be circumcised, but to cause circumcision to cease, or rather to pluck up the presumption in favour of the old and useless, and to reveal the power of the new and saving, circumcision [Baptism], that he might annul that which was after the flesh, and give vigour to that which was after the Spirit, and prove the weakness of the former, but set forth the might of the latter. To this end, having trained all the Holy Apostles and disciples in the law of the letter, and having practised them in the circumcision according to the flesh, he translated them to the circumcision of the Spirit in Baptism, that having through them cancelled the spirit of bondage, the Spirit of grace and adoption might live anew in this Divine Baptism in Christ Jesus.”

Such was the teaching of the Fathers, who in the Council of Constantinople inserted in the Creed of Nice the Article, “One Baptism for the Remission of Sins;” adopting it from the earlier Creeds, into which it was introduced, as is shown by Bishop Bull, in order to meet the heresy of the Valentinian Gnostics, of whom Irenæus (i. 18) says, that they were brought by the artifices of Satan “to a denial of Christ’s Baptism, which is “Regeneration into God, and so to the casting off of the whole “of our Faith,” *εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος, τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἀπόθεσιν.*

But let me remind you, that this was not the only addition made to the Creed by this Council. The Creed of Nice stopped at the words, “And in the Holy Ghost.” All the Articles, therefore, which follow, respecting the Holy Catholic Church,

the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Life of the world to come, were, as well as "one Baptism for the remission of sins," deemed by the Fathers necessary to a full confession of faith; all, therefore, were added. "Remission of Sins" was previously in the Roman, or Apostles' Creed. The Fathers at Constantinople expanded this, by declaring that Baptism, the "one Baptism" of Christ, is the instrument by which this remission is given.

I trust that this lengthened statement has not wearied you, and will not have been deemed altogether useless; for, although the sense, in which the Article of the Creed is to be understood, rests not on the authority of those who composed it, but on the acceptance of it by the Catholic Church, as witnessed and handed down by the second General Council, and by the whole Church subsequently—yet it is satisfactory thus to review a small part of the exact testimony borne to the faith by the most eminent of the Fathers who were present at that Council: and we have been especially called on to do this, I repeat, by the recent attempt—(ill-advised and rash, I must not scruple to call it)—which has been made by an Archdeacon of another Diocese in a Charge to his Clergy, to rob the Catholic doctrine on Baptismal Grace of the support it has always hitherto derived from our acknowledging, in the Creed, "one Baptism for the remission of sins," and to reduce that Article to a mere assertion, "that *one* Baptism—Baptism *once*—is all that is required:"—nay, he has said, that to deduce from it that remission of original sin to all infants in Baptism is not only true, but also an essential article of faith, is "so preposterous" "an inference, that the Fathers who inserted the Article would "have expressed their indignation" at any who should dare to make it. An appeal to the words of those Fathers themselves has shown us how discreetly, or indiscreetly, this has been said.

And now I come to the Declaration itself. Before I propose it, I would call on you all to witness, how anxious I have been to consult your judgments severally upon it, and the judgments of the Clergy of the Deaneries from which you come. I thank them, and you, for the suggestions which you and they have made to me. I have availed myself of them, and have adopted virtually almost all of them, as, I think, you will perceive, when you hear the Declaration as I now submit it to you, whether to advise its acceptance, or rejection.

At the close of this address, the Lord Bishop added:—As I had expressed a wish that my Clergy should act, not from any wish to compliment me, but from their own judgment, it is gratifying to me that no fewer than thirty Deaneries have chosen representatives.

DECLARATION ON BAPTISM.

The Rev. E. C. PHILLPOTTS, the Bishop's Chaplain, then read

DECLARATION I.

on Baptism, which was subsequently adopted in the form p. 46, *infra*.

The LORD BISHOP then said:—I hope the reading of this Declaration will satisfy you that I have correctly stated that I availed myself of all the objections and observations that were offered to me. As this Declaration has been much considered by you all, it might be right, perhaps, at once to ask the question, whether you advise its acceptance as an act of this Synod? If, however, any one wishes to speak upon the subject, I am sure I am not desirous to stop him, else I should propose at once that those who do assent will say "Aye." (Cries of Aye, aye.)

The Venerable Archdeacon MOORE STEVENS.—I shall think it necessary to detain your Lordship but for a very few moments. I may, with several of my brethren, have entertained some doubts, or uncertainty about the expediency of this measure which your Lordship has taken. I may also have felt some uncertainty with regard to one or two passages in this Declaration. But I have never entertained the slightest doubt as to the doctrines which your Lordship has stated in your address.

It now being near three o'clock, the hour of even-song in the Cathedral,

The LORD BISHOP said:—We cannot, of course, sit whilst Divine service is proceeding in the Cathedral. It would be impossible for the Synod to deliberate during that time; and, therefore, I suggest that we adjourn for a short time—till four o'clock.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—With your Lordship's permission, I would venture to suggest, that as the alterations made in this Declaration since the printed copies of it were sent round to the Clergy, are very material, and at the same time very satisfactory, it will be desirable to afford time to the Synod to consider them.

The LORD BISHOP.—By all means. Then I would propose, that as we have not printed copies ready at present, we should proceed with the reading of the second Declaration at four o'clock, and defer the consideration of the first, as now read, until to-morrow.

Whereupon it was determined that the Declaration on Baptism should be considered to-morrow.

Adjourned till four o'clock.

At four o'clock, after Even-song, the LORD BISHOP presiding, and all the members of the Synod being present,

The Rev. E. C. PHILLPOTTS read the following Declaration of Adherence to the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England.

DECLARATION II.

Deeply deploring the cases of defection from our Communion, which have occurred in the last ten years, even among the Clergy, which cases, few as they may be, in comparison of the whole number of our Clergy, are yet numerous, when compared with those which have occurred in our Church at any former period within the last 190 years; We hereby solemnly record our own hearty, and, with God's Blessing, unalterable, attachment to the Church in which He has called on us to serve, cordially accepting its Doctrine as set forth in its Articles of Religion and Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and thankfully acknowledging its Ministry, by Bishops, Priests and Deacons, to have descended to us in unbroken succession from the Holy Apostles:—And we further record our full conviction, that Secession from this Church, being a sound part of the Catholic Church, to any other Religious Community, is, in itself, an act of Schism, and, as such, perilous to Salvation; and in particular that secession to the Roman Community in England is not only an act of Schism, but involves also the abandonment of truth for error.

The Declaration having been read a second time,

The LORD BISHOP said:—With regard to the expression in this Declaration, “within the last 190 years,” I inserted it as meaning from the time of 1660, after the Great Rebellion. That there was a numerous secession during the Great Rebellion, though we cannot tell now to what extent it went, is certain. I dare say it was to a much greater extent than that in the last ten years; but, as I have said, I put in the words to limit the period.

The Venerable Archdeacon MOORE STEVENS.—I should like to know whether, if I concur in this Declaration as a whole, I am involved in particular expressions. Is it supposed that I concur in it as a whole, or merely in its general sentiment?

The LORD BISHOP.—In all such cases, common sense says, that we cannot hope to use every particular word according to the views and opinions of every individual. If there is nothing in it of positive principle to which you object, I hold that you concur in it as a whole.

The Venerable Archdeacon MOORE STEVENS.—My only doubt is, as to the use of the word “schism.”

The LORD BISHOP.—That appears to me, I confess, most essential, because it is an act of schism to secede from our own Church, which is a part of the Church Catholic.

The Venerable Archdeacon MOORE STEVENS.—But schism is a large word.

The LORD BISHOP.—True: there is no doubt of that. My notion of schism is, to leave a true branch of the Catholic Church. There cannot be two branches in the same country. There can be only one Church Catholic. We hold that we did not separate from Rome, but

that Rome separated from us. What was done at that time was plainly this, that here we had been holding errors in common with Rome. The Church of England was a Church—it was a branch of the Holy Catholic Church—and every branch of the Holy Catholic Church has a right to rid itself of the errors which it may formerly have held. The Church of England did rid itself of these errors which it held in common with the Church of Rome; but as we admitted the Church of Rome to hold all the articles of the Christian faith, we did not separate ourselves from *them*, and we continued to admit persons in communion with it to communicate with us for twelve years. It was Rome that separated from us. It is a great point in our controversy with Rome to contend that we are not the parties that shook her off, but that Rome shook us off; and it is the point by which we justify our position much more than by any other. Our Bishops met together and said, “There are certain errors which we renounce.” We did not renounce Rome, but we renounced Rome’s errors. Not only did Bishop Jewell declare that in the strongest possible way, but it is the foundation upon which his Apology for the Church of England rests. The 30th Canon contains a distinct assertion, that we do not depart from the Church of Italy, or any other: and it lays it down that our Church did not separate from Rome, but was cast off.

The Rev. Prebendary FORD.—It is a fact that during the first ten years of her reign there was no separation until the Pope fulminated anathemas against Elizabeth.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—Allow me to call your Lordship’s attention to one passage in this Declaration. It says, “We record our full conviction that secession from this Church, being a sound part of the Catholic Church, to any other religious community, is in itself an act of schism, and as such perilous to salvation; and that secession to the Roman community in England, is not only an act of schism, but involves also the abandonment of truth for error.” Does not this look, my Lord, as if it was not an abandonment of truth for error to join other denominations of Christians?

The LORD BISHOP.—Pardon me. It is schism to depart from a sound branch of the Church to another religious community, even if that religious community hold all the doctrines which we believe. The distinction is between schism and heresy. For instance, what is called the Independent Church in this country, affects, it is said, to hold all our doctrines, but for us to go over to them, though they may—which I do not say—hold all our doctrines, is schism; but if we go over to the Roman community, whose doctrines we know not to be in accordance with ours, is to abandon truth for error.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—So we do if we join the sect of Baptists.

The LORD BISHOP.—Exactly: and if it had been necessary to speak of Baptists, I should have said so. I do not, however, say in this case only, but in all cases, the abandonment of the Church for another religious community, though that community may hold doctrines that are true, coupled with doctrines that are untrue, is an abandonment of truth for error. If it be thought necessary to mention Baptists, I have no objection.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—No, my Lord; I merely referred to them by way of illustration.

The LORD BISHOP.—The question may be understood better by saying that you may have schism without abandoning truth for error. You may have schism, for instance, even if you adhere to every one of the truths held by our Church.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—If that is admitted, the whole argument is admitted.

The LORD BISHOP.—All I mean to say is simply this, that to abandon the Church of England for any other religious community, though it professes to hold the same truths that we do, is an act of schism : but to go to a religious community which also holds false doctrine is an abandonment of truth for error. I make it to apply to Rome particularly, because it is these secessions to Rome that have made us feel the necessity to take this step. I will illustrate my meaning. Suppose a person were to say, I will depart from this communion, and I will communicate with the Scotch Church ; that would be schism, although the Scotch Church quite agrees with us in all our doctrines.

A MEMBER.—Suppose I am abroad, am I to communicate with these Churches?

The LORD BISHOP.—If the Greek Church, for example, did not involve idolatry, or any act of sin in the Communion, about which I express no opinion, I should feel it my duty to receive the Holy Communion in their Church. The only ground for not receiving the Communion in the Church of the country in which we are, is the ground of its involving an act of sin. For instance, if a man is required to make a declaration which is false, then he is not to receive it ; but if without such declaration he can communicate with them, and if there is no act of sin, such as idolatry, I hold it is the bounden duty of every Catholic Christian to communicate in the Church of the country holding the Apostolic doctrine and fellowship, wherever he is. This is one of the foundations of Church communion.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—This appears to me to bear out an objection which I feel to two words in the latter part of the Declaration—“secession to the Roman community *in England*.” The words *in England* have been introduced, and they appear to me objectionable.

The LORD BISHOP.—They have been introduced for a good reason, but if it is thought it would be better to leave the sentence general, I have not the least objection. If I were in a country where the Roman Catholic Church is established, and I could communicate with it without joining in its sin, I should feel myself bound to do so, inasmuch as I hold the Roman Catholic Church, however corrupt, to be a part, though a corrupt part, of the Church Catholic. It is a great Church principle, that if we are in a country where it is possible to communicate with the Roman Catholic Church, without communicating in its errors and sinfulness, it is our duty so to do. The words “in England” were inserted because that is the immediate subject of the Declaration.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—The objection of Dr. Harris appears to be this, that in our country-parishes we have to deal with forms of error which are not the errors of the Roman Church. If we

state that we think secession from the Church to another Church is only an act of schism, while secession to the Roman Church involves the abandonment of truth for error, it will be understood that secession to Baptists, Socinians, and other sects, does not involve error, however erroneous their doctrines may be.

The LORD BISHOP.—Then we must be prepared with an enumeration of all possible sects ; but it seems to me that to go into that speciality would be mischievous.

The Rev. W. B. COSENS.—If it goes forth as it stands, our people may fancy that secession to any of the dissenting sects is no sin. Would it not be possible to alter the construction of the clause so as to prevent that idea being taken up ?

The LORD BISHOP.—I think that is not very complimentary to the understandings of the people in our parishes, because the phrase most distinctly is, that such separation “is in itself an act of schism.” I have no hesitation in saying that this separation is the evil of our day. I do not mean to speak lightly of persons who secede from our Church to the Baptists, or any other religious community ; but here the particular point is the Church of Rome, which, at present, we know has had so many of these secessions. It is, in fact, these secessions that make it necessary for us to move. If it had not been for these secessions I should have said nothing about the Church of Rome in this Declaration ; but, that being so, I thought it was our duty to show to the world, that we are as anxious as any persons can be, to express our sense of horror at the sin of seceding from the pure Church of England to the corrupt Church of Rome. This then is a thing of the highest moment, and for the sake of our credit with our people, for the sake of the peace of the Church, and for the sake of the feelings of the country, we should be plain in our Declarations, especially against Rome ;—not that we think Rome is worse than some modes of dissent that might be suggested, but—because it is the point of the particular existing danger.

One or two verbal alterations were here made in the Declaration. The words “in particular” were added in the last clause of the last sentence : and with these amendments it was adopted, there being five dissentients.

ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPRIC OF PLYMOUTH.

The LORD BISHOP.—On the subject of the appointment, by the Bishop of Rome, of a Roman Catholic Bishop of Plymouth, I do not propose that we protest. It is a Declaration, and not a Protest, that will be submitted to you ; because a Protest is made against authority abused. But there is no authority abused by the Bishop of Rome in this case, for it is an absolute assumption and usurpation of authority that does not exist in this country. We therefore do not protest : and whatever we do must be in the nature of a Declaration.

The Rev. E. C. PHILLPOTTS then read the Declaration, as follows :—

DECLARATION III.

Whereas the Bishop of Rome hath taken upon himself to name the Town of Plymouth in the Archdeaconry of Totnes, in our Diocese of Exeter, to be a See in subjection to the said Bishop of Rome—and this is professed to be done for the greater convenience of the “Popish Recusants” or Refusers of the Catholic Communion of the Church of England :

And whereas the predecessors of these Recusants, in or about the 12th year of Queen Elizabeth, did notoriously, in obedience to orders from Rome, renounce Communion with the Church in this land, which they had theretofore maintained,—although our Church, from which they thus separated themselves, did then hold, and has always since continued to “hold, whole and undefiled,” that Catholic Faith professed in the Nicene Constantinopolitan Creed, which the Church of Rome itself, in the 3d Session of the Council of Trent, recites and sets forth as the true faith, saying that “with such recital *alone*, as “with a Shield against Heresies, have the ancient Fathers before now “drawn Unbelievers to the Faith, overthrown Heretics, and confirmed “the Faithful, it being the firm and single Foundation, against which the “Gates of Hell shall never prevail :” neither can it be proved,—which God forbid,—that our said Church had, at the time of such separation, nor since at any time hath, lost the Grace of the Holy Sacraments :

And whereas it is notorious, that, in order to keep the said Separatists in obedience to Rome, new Articles of Faith, added to the said Creed, contrary to the 7th Canon of the III. General Council of Ephesus, were imposed and insisted upon, as necessary to salvation :

And whereas the government of, and ministrations for, the said Separatists, were at first, and for many years, not under any Bishop ; and afterwards, for more than 200 years, were directed by Bishops having their Titles from ancient extinct Sees “in partibus Infidelium,” and exercising pretended Spiritual Jurisdiction in England, as Vicars Apostolical so called of the Bishop of Rome, thus treating this Realm as under the jurisdiction of Rome :—which Vicars Apostolical were either Bishops without Sees, ordained as such, contrary to the 6th Canon of the General Council of Chalcedon, and to the known rules of the Catholic Church ; or else being ordained as Bishops of Sees in the Eastern Church, without the concurrence of the Metropolitans, were so ordained in direct violation of the 4th and 6th Canons of the I. General Council of Nice :

And whereas the recent pretended appointment of Sees in England, and particularly of the See of Plymouth, by the Bishop of Rome, contrary to the 2d Canon of the II. General Council of Constantinople, has been manifestly designed to erect the said Separatists into a Church, in opposition to the true Catholic Church in England, by nominating Sees without the concurrence of the Metropolitan, for the so-called Metropolitan Archbishop of Westminster is no Metropolitan, having been set up contrary to ancient custom, and to the 6th Canon of Nice, in evident violation of the old Metropolitan Sees of England :

For all these reasons, We, the Bishop and Clergy of the said Diocese, in Synod assembled, do hereby declare, that the said appointment of a See of Plymouth by the Bishop of Rome, being contrary to the Canons of the Catholic Church, is manifestly schismatical and void,—that it sets up Altar against Altar in our said Diocese, and usurps the Primacy of England.

And we further declare, in respect of this and the other differences, which unhappily, during 300 years, have divided the Churches of the West, that we desire to renew the appeal, under which we and our Fathers have so long continued, to a lawful and free Council of the whole Church, whenever such Council may be had, commending our cause, in the meanwhile, under Him who will come to be our Judge, to the earnest prayers and to the enlightened and impartial inquiries of all good Christian People.

On the motion of the Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON, seconded by the Rev. Dr. HARRIS, this Declaration was adopted unanimously, and without discussion.

The LORD BISHOP.—I am rejoiced, particularly, at this Declaration having been carried unanimously, because I believe it will have great weight.

Adjourned till after Morning Prayer to-morrow (Thursday).

SESSION II. Thursday, June 26th.

The Synod assembled again at eleven o'clock, having previously attended Morning Service in the Cathedral.

DECLARATION OF BAPTISM.

The LORD BISHOP.—The great business that is to be taken into consideration to-day is the Declaration of Baptism. I have had the Declaration reprinted as it will be proposed. I have had observations made to me, upon two sides, respecting the first line in the Declaration. As it stands now it is as follows :—

“Adverting to the circumstances of the time in which we are called “to minister in this reformed portion of the Church of Christ, we deem “it necessary to declare—”

and so on. Some members of the Synod are of opinion that it is desirable not to make any reference to the circumstances of the time. My own opinion, I frankly own, was in favour of making some allusion to them, but I find that this was the opinion of some ; and if I had found there was no other, I should have thoroughly acquiesced. But it has also been suggested to me by others, and I own I think they are right, that there ought to be some reference made to them. I have, therefore, thought that the opinions of both might be satisfied by making a very slight alteration, as follows :—

“We, the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, in Synod “assembled, at this time deem it necessary to declare,” &c. And this will be the form in which the Declaration will be proposed.

There is one other point I may be permitted to mention. In this Declaration we have already had the advantage of considering the objections that have been received, after very ample opportunity had been afforded to make them. I can truly say that to these objections I have given my whole time and attention, and I believe it will be found that there is scarcely one of any considerable importance that has not, in some way, been met in this paper. I will, therefore, put it—I do not like to use the word “feelings” upon this occasion—but I will put it to the consideration of the members of the Synod, whether it be desirable now to be finding out fresh objections. If they are important, certainly we will not pass them over because they did not strike us until now : but if we are to endeavour to make the document as perfect as every one might wish, and to correspond precisely to all our separate opinions, I am afraid we shall find the task a very serious one. I, therefore, put it to the consideration of the members of the Synod, whether we shall now be finding out objections which we have already had an opportunity of finding, and of stating, unless those objections are really of a very grave kind.

The Rev. E. C. PHILLPOTTS then read the Declaration, as follows :—

We, the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, in Synod assembled, at this time deem it necessary to declare our firm and immovable adherence to that great Article of Faith, “One Baptism for the remission of sins ;” affirming it, as it is authoritatively set forth in the Nicene Creed by the Second Œcumenical Council, has since been held by the Catholic Church in all ages, and is taught unequivocally by our own Church in its authorized formularies, especially in the Offices of Baptism and in the Catechism ;—and we are the rather induced to make this Declaration, because we hope, that many, who are now divided from us, may be brought to agreement by thus knowing the real meaning and extent of the doctrine which we hold.—

Therefore we declare that,

I. Acknowledging “One Baptism for the remission of sins,” we hold as of faith that all persons, duly baptized, (and being adults, with fit qualifications,) are not only baptized ONCE FOR ALL, but also are baptized with the ONE TRUE BAPTISM of Him who “baptizeth with the Holy Ghost,” and who thus making us to “be born again of water and of the Spirit,” delivers us thereby from the guilt and bondage of all our sins, of original and past sin absolutely and at once, of sins committed after Baptism conditionally, when with hearty repentance and true faith we turn unto God.

We hold, as implied in the aforesaid Article of the Creed, all the great graces ascribed to Baptism in our Catechism—For, “by one Spirit we are all baptized into one Body,” even the Body of Jesus Christ ; we are made to be “His Body,” “Members in particular” of His Body, “MEMBERS OF CHRIST.”—And being thus “baptized unto Him, we were baptized into His death,” who “died for our sins,”—we are “dead with Him”—“dead unto sin”—“buried with Him in

“Baptism wherein also we are risen with Him,”—“quickened together with Him,”—“made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus;”—“our life is hid with Christ in God.”—Believing that the Holy Ghost so joins us in Baptism to Jesus Christ, that we are “in Him,” “created in Christ Jesus,” we believe also that we are CHILDREN OF GOD in Him; and “if children, then heirs, heirs of GOD, and joint-heirs with Christ,” INHERITORS OF THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

II. We hold, accordingly, that all Infants, presented either in Church or privately, according to the Book of Common Prayer, and baptized with water in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, do in and by Baptism “receive remission of sins by “spiritual regeneration,” and are made Members of Christ, being spiritually ingrafted and incorporated into His Mystical Body; original sin being so far from an obstacle to the right reception of Baptism, that, as St. Augustine says, “Infants, because they are not as yet guilty of any “actual sin, have the ORIGINAL SIN, that is in them, remitted through “the grace of Him who saveth ‘by the washing of regeneration;’” and as our own Church declares, that the baptized Child, “being born IN “ORIGINAL SIN, and in the wrath of God, is by the laver of regeneration “in Baptism received into the number of the children of God, and heirs “of everlasting life; for our Lord Jesus Christ doth not deny His grace “and mercy unto such infants, but most lovingly doth call them unto “Him:”—and in accordance therewith, the 27th Article expressly says that “the Baptism of young children is most agreeable with the “institution of Christ.”

III. We hold, that the imparting of the aforesaid graces in the Baptism of young children is not hypothetical,—depending either on the sincerity of those who present them, or upon any other conditions; for else it would follow, that in cases in which the said conditions do not take place, both the Form of Baptism itself, and the Article “One “Baptism for the remission of sins,” must be understood not as true but as false and unreal.

IV. Lastly we hold, and would earnestly impress upon all Christians, that the foregoing statements, rightly understood, so far from disparaging the need of conversion and amendment, are a most powerful incentive to newness of life, and, especially, to fervent prayer for renewed or continued grace, so long as the term of our probation in this life shall last. For, Baptism being the ordinance and instrument of Christ, by which we are “born again of the Spirit,” it binds us to do that which it enables us to do, “to walk in the Spirit, and not to fulfil the lusts of the “flesh;” for “if we live after the flesh we shall die, but if we through “the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, we shall live.” Baptism makes our “Body” to be “the Temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in “us, which we have of GOD;” and “if any man defile the Temple of “GOD, him shall GOD destroy, for the Temple of GOD is holy.” Wherefore it follows, that they who, being baptized, live not after the Spirit, but after the flesh, do thereby draw on themselves greater damnation, or if “by the Grace of GOD they arise again,” have need of the deeper repentance as having done despite to the Spirit which was in them.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—I venture to rise before this solemn assembly thus early, for reasons which I hope will be apparent as I go on, and which I also hope will excuse any seeming presumption in my rising first, in the presence of those who are my seniors, and far better and wiser men than myself. But there are circumstances which appear to my mind to justify me in so doing ; and, therefore, I hope when I shall have finished what little I have to say, I shall, at least, stand excused in the eyes of my reverend brethren. Before I sit down, my Lord, I shall conclude with the motion which, with your Lordship's leave, I will now read :—"That this Declaration," which has been just read to us, to which we have given the greatest attention in its original form, which has now received alterations only in accordance with what was suggested by ourselves, and which appears to me to be perfectly satisfactory in the form in which it is now presented to us—"That this Declaration be accepted and ratified by this Synod," precisely as it stands, and I hope we shall do so, *uno ore, uno animo*. But there do appear to me—and I am not alone in my judgment, otherwise I should not have relied upon it—to be certain circumstances which ought to be stated in connexion with this great subject, before we proceed to the actual adoption of the Resolution. I do trust there will be no objection started in any quarter, as certainly I shall start none, as is apparent from my motion, to its unanimous acceptance. I also most fervently trust and pray that, in anything I may say, I may give no occasion of offence to any man present or absent. I also trust that what I may say, may, by God's blessing, be for the good of the Church which we all serve, and the honour and glory of the Master Who is the head of it. Now, my Lord, the main point which I shall venture to dwell upon, will be to illustrate, and to show the propriety of, the word "necessary," in the beginning of this Declaration. My reverend brethren will observe that it commences :—

"We, the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, in Synod assembled, at this time deem it necessary to declare," &c. &c.

I do believe from the bottom of my heart that it is most necessary ; and that is the point which I shall endeavour shortly to demonstrate. Let me say, as I have already said, that I wish not to hurt the feelings of any man, absent or present ; and, also that I speak under a most deep sense of responsibility. I speak under a sense of that sort of responsibility which a man must entertain who knows that he is engaged upon the most solemn subject which can occupy the thoughts or the mind of man, and who knows that he is speaking words, before a grave, solemn, and sacred assembly, of which he will have to give account at the great day of judgment. And here, my Lord, I would wish to introduce to the notice of this Synod, words far better, and of far higher authority than any I can enunciate from my own mind. When I say, then, that they are the words of Bishop Selwyn, I need not say more to guarantee your attention to them ; and not only are they Bishop Selwyn's words, but they are his words addressed to a Diocesan Synod, upon the subject of Diocesan Synods, and they em-

brace also, in a short paragraph, which will serve to introduce the rest, the general question of Synodical action in the English Church.

"My belief is," says Bishop Selwyn, in his address to the New Zealand Synod in 1847—"my belief is, that the cause which has led "to the almost entire suspension of the synodical action of the Church "has been the forgetfulness of the spiritual character of such an "assembly of the Clergy. By close alliance with worldly systems, "they seem to have lost their own inherent strength, and to have "become unable to wield the sword of the Spirit."

Then he says that some Synods have brought disrepute upon themselves and upon the system by the conduct of the individuals composing them; and he adds:—

"But if we resolve to conduct our deliberations in the spirit of "humility and of prayer, contending neither for superiority, nor "honour, nor victory, but simply and humbly seeking the truth as "it is in Jesus; if we avoid pride of order and dignity, and the "opposite but not less fatal error of servility to the ruling powers of "the State;—upon this exclusion of earthly causes of disagreement "we may rest our hopes of obtaining that fulness of light which is the "promised fruit of singleness of eye."

My reverend brethren, it is in that spirit, which is, I suppose, the spirit of Christian charity, neither seeking her own, nor yet being ambitious in any way of glory, but loving the truth—it is in that spirit of charity I would humbly endeavour to speak to you, and it is in that spirit of charity, I trust, that you will receive the words, which, however imperfectly, I may use. Now, my Lord, my point is this—I say it is necessary for us to speak. My reverend brethren, it is high time for the Church of England, in some regular way, to speak out. I have had many opportunities,—far more than most of my reverend brethren, (which is no cause of boasting, but it is matter of fact,) I have had, I say, more opportunities than most of my reverend brethren for knowing that. There is a wide-spreading and a wide-spread feeling of perplexity, and doubt, and dismay, prevailing among the members, the most attached members, of our Church upon this one specific ground; and again I say, let me speak it without offence, my object is to promote unity and not discord, not to excite discussion but to terminate disputes, upon this one specific ground, that neither the Bishops as a body, nor our learned Universities as a body, nor our Capitular bodies, in all the anxious questions which have vexed and agitated the Church for many years past, have ever spoken out to hush the storm. My Lord, I do know, from extensive information, that that special cause has been at the bottom of the greatest part of the disturbance of men's minds in our own Church. Hence, and I speak it confidently, there have been many doubting minds, hence there have been some advancing to the edge of the mire of despondency, and some that have actually fallen into it. Hence there have been some that we have loved, and whom we cannot but love still, who have left the arms of the spiritual mother that begat them, and gone to one who has beguiled them to her bosom, and like another syren, when she has

got them in her power, has morally and spiritually transformed them. I speak this with the deepest grief, because there are among these men some that I have loved and valued as I have loved my own heart's blood; but I cannot conceal from myself the fact, that I do know, in many instances, that it has arisen from this cause. Only a few short days ago, I received a letter from one reverend brother who has just joined the Church of Rome, and he says, especially, that this was the cause which drove him there. Now, my Lord, I trust I am saying nothing unbecomming this solemn occasion, when I do at this time, not before a mixed multitude, but in the presence of my reverend brethren, declare what I know to be the truth, and what I believe to be a most important truth for us to consider. Let me now, my Lord, very briefly state what many of these gentlemen have stated to me to be the quick process of their reasoning; but let it not be supposed I go with them to their conclusions. They have said thus:—"We have had questions touching the very life of Christianity agitated in our Church; we have found those who were our natural leaders, and whose place and duty it was to guide us in our difficulties and to resolve our doubts—" we have found them, not leading us, not guiding us, not resolving our doubts; and that appears to us to indicate, too surely, that the Church which is without a living voice, is without life or utterance." I have said, my Lord, I follow them not to their conclusions, for they are false; but certainly it is lamentable, most lamentable, that so much ground should have been given to lead them to the very edge of the conclusion. I go not with them—of course I do not: but I do most deeply sympathise with them in their original difficulties, and I cannot but remember that there is a solemn text in Holy Writ: "Woe unto them by whom the offence cometh," and "Woe unto them that offend any of the little ones," who may be weak in faith or in argument. I will venture, my Lord, to say one more thing. It is well known to all those whom I am addressing that there has been an irregular action, of late years, in our Church. I call it an irregular, an anomalous, and an undesirable action, ἀνὰ νόμον; but under the circumstances and with reference to the end, I do say that that action, irregular as it may have been, was necessary. I allude to the action of Church Unions. But they spring also from this identical cause; and if any man condemns their existence let him do his best to remove the cause. My object in speaking now is to remove the occasion for the existence of these anomalous bodies. No man has contended more earnestly than I for their preservation at present; but no man would be more glad than I should, to sign the death warrant of every Church Union in the country. It is true, historically, that Church Unions sprung out of an individual case, (into the merits of which I am not going to enter, nor am I about to enter into the merits of any other individual case; because I should be exciting discussions which I think I ought to avoid;) but I must say, as an historical fact, that it was after that case,—which I may venture to call a lamentable case,—of the decision as to the Bishopric of Hereford, that Church Unions took their rise. Men did say, "We feel that great and vital questions of

“ our faith are at stake ; we look to our natural leaders ; we call upon them for help ; we call upon our Bishops as a body ; we call upon our Universities as a body ; we call upon our Capitular bodies, whose very office it is to act as counsel to their Bishop, and as defenders of the integrity of the faith, we call upon them to help us ; we call from morning to night ; we look for the least indication of the fire of zeal falling from them, but there is no voice, no answer.” “ Our natural leaders,” said they, “ lead us not ; but God is our leader ; we are sworn soldiers of the Cross, and if we may not fight as a regular army under our regular leaders against the enemy, *pro aris et focis*, let us have a guerilla warfare *pro Deo et pro Ecclesiâ.*” This is, my Lord, I humbly submit, the strictly true history of those anomalous, but necessary, bodies ; and I would put it to this meeting, to this sacred assembly,—sacred in character and in object,—whether it be not in the very highest degree lamentable, that the Church that we have loved, and (God willing) will love until we die, should give occasion to the enemy to blaspheme, and to her friends to blush and tremble for her honour ? Now, my Lord, I have but one word more. The last and greatest attacks upon her have been made in the point of faith. I think we heard yesterday more than enough to convince us, if we are capable of conviction, that this Declaration, in point of doctrine, is accordant with the voice of Scripture—with the voice of God. I enter not, therefore, into the doctrinal merits of the case ; but I say, upon that question, touching, evidently, the very centre of the faith, even here there was no voice to lead or to guide us ; and I may say it is not Church Unions, neither is it the Clergy alone, who have felt this, but, as I can speak from my own experience, it is the laity of the middle orders, the respectable and wish-to-do-well members of the Church, who have sought, and asked, and complained that they have sought and asked in vain, what, as members of the Church of England, they were to believe and what they were not. I do say, then, my Lord, it is high time that the Church of England should speak out with a voice of authority ; and, if I may be permitted to say so, my Lord, in your presence, from the very bottom of my heart I thank you, from my heart and soul I thank you, that you have given us this opportunity of meeting as a Diocesan Synod, to declare our convictions upon this vital point of doctrine as well as upon other points. And I trust, with the blessing of Almighty God, that this will be but the initiative of further proceedings. I trust that we shall come from speaking as a Diocesan Synod without authority to bind the Church, to submit ourselves to the legitimate and authoritative voice of the Church, binding us, and all who are her members, in the golden links of concord and agreement. I will not detain the Synod one moment more, except earnestly to ask them to give up, if they have such, any private opinion as to little words, and *uno ore et uno animo affirmare* what they believe to be God’s truth. My Resolution, my Lord, is, that the Declaration as now read be accepted by this Synod.

The Ven. Archdeacon MOORE STEVENS.—I beg leave to say, that I do not concur with all the observations I have just now heard. I do

not think we are come here for the purpose of condemning those who oppose us. I cannot therefore hear without protest, condemnations of the bench of Bishops, or of the Capitular bodies ; nor can I allow them to have been guilty of the neglect with which they are charged. Most of the members of Capitular bodies are like myself parish priests ; and I am satisfied that we do our duty most conscientiously in propagating the true doctrine of the Church of England. There may be exceptions ; I do not say there are not ; but I believe they all teach true doctrine ; and I do not think they are guilty of the neglect imputed to them. Nor do I, as I have already said, think that either the Bishops or the Capitular bodies are guilty of the neglect which seems to be imputed to them.

The LORD BISHOP.—I beg the Archdeacon's pardon, but he must see that we are now getting a little irregular. It would be more in order if some one were to second the Resolution in the first instance ; and then it will be perfectly regular for the Archdeacon to address the Synod upon it.

The Rev. JOHN DOWNALL.—I rise, my Lord, to second the Resolution. I second it with all my heart, in the spirit in which it has been proposed ; and I beg to say, that I am totally unable to concur in the objection which seems to have been started by the Archdeacon of Exeter.

The LORD BISHOP.—In point of order, the Resolution should have been seconded before the Archdeacon addressed the Synod upon it ; and we all know that the Archdeacon is one of the last men in the world to obtrude himself upon such an assembly irregularly. Do not let us, therefore, now enter upon a consideration of what he has said, for it should not have come in until after the Resolution had been seconded.

The Ven. Archdeacon MOORE STEVENS.—I beg pardon for the irregularity. I conceived that the motion had been seconded.

The Rev. JOHN DOWNALL.—I must, however, in seconding the Resolution, be permitted to say that the impression made upon my mind by the observations of my reverend brother who submitted it, was quite the contrary to that produced in the mind of the Archdeacon. I believe that Mr. Oxenham did not intend to pass judgment upon the Bishops or the Capitular bodies ; but simply to speak of an historical fact.

Mr. Prebendary OXENHAM.—I accept that explanation as being the true one.

The LORD BISHOP.—That was your meaning?

Mr. Prebendary OXENHAM.—Yes, my Lord.

The Rev. J. NUTCOMBE GOULD.—The question having been moved and seconded, I am in your Lordship's hands to know whether I am in order in now rising to address the Synod upon the subject of this Declaration ?

The LORD BISHOP.—Certainly.

The Rev. J. NUTCOMBE GOULD.—I feel, my Lord, knowing as I do my own very great weakness, that it is almost presumptuous in me to come forward, before such an assembly as this, described as it has been so properly and so well by my reverend relative (Mr. Oxenham)—an assembly having all the dignity, and, if possible, more than the dignity

that he has ascribed to it. But I feel also, my Lord, that I stand in this position. I am a Presbyterian summoned by your Lordship to your council; and I should not be an honest man if I did not speak my solemn opinion, and humbly endeavour to tender to your Lordship my most respectful counsel. Your Lordship deprecated, and most properly deprecated, trifling objections, and (if I may venture so to express it,) overmuch speaking upon unimportant subjects; but, my Lord, we are a grave and solemn assembly indeed, and we must take for our motto, *Festina lente*. I speak so, because I feel, and feel very deeply, that in the transactions of yesterday there was, I fear, some little degree of hurry. Hurry would be an irreparable evil at such a moment. We may commit ourselves, at this present moment, by hurry, and by want of deep, solemn, and prayerful consideration, to an extent that we can never recover from. Your Lordship's words were, that it was impossible to expect that this paper should be made verbally perfect. There will always, I grant, be a temptation, in acute minds, to amend certain expressions, and to carry out, in their own form, their own sentiments, and to give to them their appropriate value. There is a great temptation, I say, to do this, and your Lordship, I think, acted wisely in cautioning the Synod; but, my Lord, it is important that, as far as we possibly can, we make this paper doctrinally perfect.

THE LORD BISHOP.—I wish to say at once, in answer to that, that possibly I might have failed to express what I meant, though I do not think I did; but I intended to say, that my reason for discouraging unimportant discussion was, that important discussion might take place. I said, particularly, that this was an important subject, and that I trusted, nay, I was quite sure, we should have it dealt with according to its importance. It is for this reason I am very glad we are now having discussion; and I wish it to be distinctly understood, that it was the last thing in my mind to check discussion upon the real points of the question. I do not want to refer to what took place yesterday; but I must say my object was, and is, to prevent waste of time by the discussion of trifling objections.

THE REV. J. NUTCOMBE GOULD.—My reverend friend who moved the Resolution has said, my Lord, it was time to speak out, and I most fully concur with him. It is time, indeed, to speak out. Feeling my own weakness, I have never been before, and I trust I never may be again, called upon to take anything like a prominent part in this great controversy. I feel my incapacity to do so. But I am driven indeed now, if ever, to take my stand. I feel there is a great and a warning cry, "Who is upon my side?" I feel that your Lordship has put that question in the name of the Church of Christ; and with all my heart I for one respond to the call of your Lordship, as an upper servant in that Church; and I am ready to come forward, in my humble capacity, to do all, in the strength of God, that I may be called upon to do, in this great and vital cause. We are, my Lord, an army in the presence of an enemy. Your Lordship is our appointed leader. Your Lordship takes your stand "*in articulo stantis aut cadentis ecclesie*," and your army will support you, and will fight in this cause

unto the death. *Pro Deo, et pro Ecclesia!* I therefore fully concur in what has fallen from my reverend brother, in the expressions of his thankfulness to your Lordship for having convoked this Synod. I thank you, indeed, from my heart. I feel, and know, that you are, my Lord, surrounded by a faithful and an attached Presbytery, who know the truth, who love the truth, and who, under the guidance of their appointed sacred head, will do their best to guard it. There are a thousand topics which rush into my mind in connexion with this subject, but I will not now intrude them upon the attention of the Synod. I will rather follow in the path that has been chalked out for us, in the commencement of this Meeting, by the Sermon which we yesterday heard; and I will only, in conclusion, express my earnest hope that every act, proceeding from this Synod, may be deeply, solemnly, and prayerfully deliberated, and that every word spoken may be spoken in the spirit of love and charity.

The Rev. Prebendary HOLE.—I trust that I may be permitted to address a few words to your Lordship and the Synod, in the full conviction—which is also the conviction of many others—how important it is that the proposition which has been moved and seconded should meet with our unanimous approval. I trust that verbal objections may disappear: and I hope that the main points of the great doctrine of the Christian faith which this Declaration contains being clearly laid down in, and resting immovably on, the foundations of holy writ, it will receive, without debate, our cordial concurrence. I trust that the moral effect of this unanimity, which will go forth to others, far and wide—that the moral effect of our unanimous acceptance of this Declaration, will far outweigh in importance any verbal improvement that might be made in it. If that be so, there is an answer at once to one grave objection which has been urged, in many quarters, to our meeting here this day,—that we could do nothing to the purpose, because we could do nothing legal. No doubt that we can do nothing by the bonds and words of human legislation. No doubt we cannot bind, but we need not bind, by human legislation; but if, by the voice of God in His word, by the voice of this Synod in full concurrence therewith, having weighed and deliberated this great point under the guidance of our Chief Pastor, if we declare that which shall be found to be the truth, then shall we be bound by bonds, not from earth, but from heaven, in one heart and one mind, as ministers and members of the Church of England. My Lord, there is one point only upon which I shall venture to speak, for which I may express my deep thankfulness,—that in this Declaration not only do we lay the foundations, and confirm them, of the doctrine of baptismal grace, but we take also occasion to try, by God's blessing, to bind together the hearts of those who are separated from us, not in reality but, as we are assured, by misconception. This is an argument which has been maintained earnestly by those whose voices have infinitely greater weight than I can pretend to have. The passage in our Declaration to which I allude is the concluding clause. After having spoken of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and declared that we are thereby made members of Christ, children of

God, and inheritors of His kingdom ; your Lordship has taught us here, and we respond from the heart to the teaching, that not only are we bound to proclaim, according to this Declaration, the blessing of God which we received in our infancy, but that in our teaching we ought also to be mindful of the thousands and tens of thousands of those who have received grace in their infancy, but who have left it unimproved, who have lived and grown up in ignorance and in sin, almost heathens, in the midst of a Christian country. In the last paragraph it is said, that "we hold, and would earnestly impress upon "all Christians, that the foregoing statements, rightly understood, do "not disparage the need of conversion." Now it was upon the ground that so many nominally Christians needed a real conversion of the heart to God, that Mr. Wesley founded his teaching ; and here he placed that lever, with which he moved a considerable portion of the Christian world. He said, "Man must be born again ;" and though, in his explication of the doctrine, he departed from the express words of Scripture, and the interpretations of the Catholic Church, yet, when he pressed the necessity of conversion, he found in the hearts of thousands, who knew nothing of their Baptism, the response, that they were conscious of having lived as heathens, and that repentance, and faith in a Saviour, were as a "resurrection from the dead" to them. And so he obtained his influence. This was in a time of great coldness in the Church of England ; yet there was no need to have departed from her, since she held the whole of the true doctrine on these subjects, in her formularies, as it should have been heard in the voice of her living teachers. I am thankful, then, that while we speak highly in our Declaration, of the blessings of our Baptism, we do not confine ourselves to these "first principles" only, nor disparage the need of conversion, of the real turning of the heart to God. Nay, while I am thus speaking, may we not, some at least among ourselves, find in our own bosoms an acknowledgment of this as true, that had not the grace of God awakened us to the perception of Divine truths long after Baptism, and, it may be, even after long departure from His ways, we had not valued either our Baptismal mercies, or the blessedness of knowing our Lord and Saviour, as we humbly trust we know him now ? If we feel these things as we ought, are we not bound to tell them to the millions to whom these truths are so precious ? Let me say one word more, in a spirit not to provoke, but I hope rather to shorten, discussion. Let me allude to one great and important section of the Church of England. It is the firm belief in the minds of many, that if they to whom I allude did but apprehend that the true doctrine of baptismal grace does not exclude their great point, viz. the doctrine of conversion, they would come in as one man, and all say, "We are brethren together, and though there is a "cloud that has separated us hitherto, by God's mercy it will be cleared "up." Sometimes I have thought, I confess, that we were destined to die in that cloud, but I trust better things now. I think the clouds will be greatly cleared away by these discussions, and that out of the bitter will come the sweet, and that even out of the decision of the Judicial

Committee of the Privy Council shall proceed the "resurrection from the dead" of the Church of England. If it be so, who will not give God thanks? Be this as it may, is it not an argument for our unanimous acceptance of this Declaration, that it embraces the whole, and not a part only, of the Truth? Shall we not, with the greater authority, teach our congregations upon these points, after solemnly proclaiming here, both the reality and value of Baptismal blessings, and the necessity of the conversion of the soul to God, without which Baptism itself will only cause our greater condemnation? There is a passage in S. Augustine in which he seems to me to have almost had such a Declaration as this before him. In commenting upon one of the Psalms he has this point in view; and to show how it was dealt with by him who is the great defender of baptismal grace, while preaching the great doctrine of the conversion of the soul, and the turning of the conscience towards its Maker, I will read it. "We hold," says one writer who quotes the passage, "we hold that the course of divine grace is such as is described in the 103d Psalm. 'First,' says S. Augustine, (De Spiritu, cap. 29,) commenting upon that Psalm, 'He forgiveth all thy sins.' That is done in the sacrament of baptism. Next, 'He healeth all thine infirmities.' That is done in the believer's earthly 'life; 'so long as the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit 'against the flesh,' which infirmities, pertaining to our old condition, 'if with constant purpose we go onward, are in daily course of healing; our renewed state advancing 'through faith which worketh by 'love.' Thirdly, 'He redeemeth thy life from corruption.' This is 'done in the final resurrection: and lastly, 'He crowneth thee with 'mercy and loving-kindness.' This is done in the judgment.' By 'which sayings of S. Augustine we may understand the necessity 'there is for the turning of the conscious will towards God in all who 'live to have a conscious will, since without such change of heart 'and life, the regenerating grace of Baptism will only serve to our 'greater condemnation." My Lord, these are the very words almost in which you have closed the Declaration,—words too, in which I hope our discussion itself may be closed, so that we may deal with the truth in the love of it, and have it impressed upon our hearts.

The LORD BISHOP.—Before I put the question I must say that a paper has been put into my hands, which I highly approve, as expressing more tersely and more clearly (whether more accurately I will not say, but at least decidedly better,) one important sentence in the Declaration. At present it stands in the first clause that Baptism "delivers us from the bondage of our sins." It has been suggested to me that that truth would be expressed better, and I will frankly own I think it is expressed greatly better in these words, "Deliver us 'thereby from the guilt and bondage of all our sins, of original and 'past sin, absolutely and at once, of sins committed after Baptism, 'conditionally, when with hearty repentance and true faith we turn 'unto God." I purpose to put the Declaration with these words substituted. I venture to think that my reverend brethren will, with myself, heartily approve of them.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—As the mover of the Declaration I beg, my Lord, to express my concurrence most fully in the suggested alterations. On this point I wish to avoid anything like division or discussion, and therefore, with the permission of the Synod, I will accept the words, and consider them part of the Declaration as first read.

The LORD BISHOP put the question, and the Declaration was unanimously adopted.

This being done, the whole Synod rose, and the BISHOP solemnly said, "Thank God for this: let His holy name be praised!" The Synod responded "Amen."

EXETER DIOCESAN TRAINING COLLEGE.

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—In bringing before your Lordship and my reverend brethren a Resolution connected with the Exeter Diocesan Training College, I will, as I am required by the amount of business before the Synod, be very brief. Others will subsequently address your Lordship upon the different points connected with our Diocesan Education; but the Resolution I have in my hand has simply reference to the Exeter Diocesan Training College. I will first state what has been already done; and what have been the past labours of the Diocesan Board. We have, thus far, sent out thirty-three masters, who are, or who were at Christmas last, employed as masters of Schools. We have nineteen resident in the College. We have lost, from various causes, twelve, many of whom had been duly educated; but if that circumstance can for a moment cause any apprehension or difficulty in the mind of any gentleman present, I will beg him to remember that in the York Training School, which is admirably endowed, and which is one of the five recognised Privy Council Colleges, it was declared in the last return that they have lost nearly 20 per cent. We, with all our disadvantages, have lost a less number than one of the best circumstanced of the recognised training colleges. But, in future, we shall not lose so many. Hitherto, many who have gone out as masters, were compelled to leave their positions, upon account of their small salaries; but as we hope that in future all masters who leave will obtain a certificate of merit, there will necessarily follow an increased stipend and gratuities on the part of the government, and therefore they will not have that inducement to leave the Diocese which seems hitherto to have been the case. With regard, next, to the successful competitors for certificates of merit: every person who is friendly towards the Exeter Diocesan Training College will be delighted to learn that the three persons, two pupils and one master, who were sent up to the last examination, three or four weeks ago, have all obtained certificates of merit. One, a lad of eighteen, who came to us at fifteen, knowing little or nothing, has obtained a certificate of the second class; and when we know, that out of 700 certificated masters, there are not twenty-five with certificates of the first class, we shall be able to appreciate, duly, the character of the second. I will now proceed to state what we hope to

do, in future, in order to augment the funds of the Board through the medium of the Local Boards, and likewise to obtain pupils. There are, my Lord, in this Diocese,—a fact, which many perhaps will be astonished to learn, as I was myself this morning, when I referred to the document sent down from London last night—there are at this moment, in this Diocese, 134 pupil teachers. There are 55 schools having pupil teachers. Three years ago there were not more than 5. There are, likewise,—showing the wants of the Diocese in this respect,—only 13 certificated masters. In Cornwall, there are 59 pupil teachers; in Devon, 75. Our wish is, that every master educated at the Diocesan College shall be enabled to take, when he leaves the College, a class certificate. That may alarm, perhaps, some persons, but it only comes to this—that our masters may be enabled to take pupil teachers, because, if they are not certificated, they are required to be one year in advance of their pupil teachers. We have always applications for masters capable of taking pupil teachers. If the pupil teacher should be in his fourth year, the master when he enters upon his duties must be competent to take him through the fifth year: and the consequence is, that the master who has gone through five years' apprenticeship will thus be competent to take a Government class certificate. With regard to those who do not, as we hope to see them do, settle in the Diocese, it must be understood that many of the managers of our Schools now apply to S. Mark's or to Battersea, or to other training colleges, because we have not, under existing circumstances, a sufficient supply of certificated masters. The last point in the Resolution I am about to move has reference to the erection of a College. Unless we have funds to build this College we shall not be placed in that position which, I think, we ought to hold. We are, at this moment, left in the unpleasant and difficult position, of finding out our own deficiencies. We have no inspection from Government. No inspector comes down to us, to point out where we are defective. And why? Because our premises and buildings are not what are required. We have applied year after year for inspection, and the answer is, invariably "No; not "with your present defects." But, on the other hand, if we were enabled to build the College, we should have a proper staff of masters: we should have from year to year an inspector, and, as I was told the other day by one of Her Majesty's Inspectors, year by year payments on account of those very certificates which the pupils obtain. During the last year we have had five certificated men; and we should have received 40*l.* per head for those several boys. All that is now withheld from us. They allow us, as an act of courtesy, to send our boys to be examined, but they withhold the grants which they give on account of all the Chelsea men until we have a College in accordance with their requirements. I shall, upon this point, be happy to reply to any question which any of my reverend brethren may think proper to ask.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—Is there any estimate prepared of the cost of the College?

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—Yes : the estimate is about 7,000*l.* After these observations, I will, without further trespassing upon the attention of the Synod, move the following Resolution :—

1. “We, the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese of Exeter, in Synod assembled, duly appreciating the advantages which this Diocese has already derived from the Diocesan Training College, and feeling confident, from the proficiency of the pupils in training, as evidenced by their late successful competition for ‘certificates of merit,’ that the wants of this Diocese may be fully supplied by the Exeter Diocesan College, if duly supported ;

“RESOLVE,

“(1.) To promote the interests of the Training College in our several Deaneries, through the medium of the Local Boards, by augmenting the funds applicable to the purpose of the College, by endeavouring to obtain pupils, and especially by recommending for admission pupil teachers and stipendiary monitors, who may have successfully completed their term of apprenticeship ; and we further resolve to aid the Diocesan Board in their endeavour to erect a College capable of receiving an increased number of pupils.”

These pupil teachers, who now amount (the males) to 98, will, nearly all of them, be anxious to become masters of schools. I have interrogated those in Exeter, 14 in number, and they say they should like it. But we should not like to send out these men—lads of 18—before they are really trained, mostly or merely, for they do not live in College but at home. Every one of these we hope to bring into our own training college, in order that they shall at least have the advantage of being trained under the guidance of the principal and clergy who founded the College.

The LORD BISHOP.—It was very properly asked just now, whether there had been an estimate of the cost of building the College, and the sum of 7,000*l.* was stated as the probable amount. I do not know the fact myself, but does the Chancellor mean that the 7,000*l.* includes the aid of the Government ? Is there 7,000*l.* to be raised for the erection ?

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—My reply included the grant from the Government ; but, of course, the amount to be expended will depend upon the number of pupils we shall receive. The Government, when we inquired, said, “We do not like the admission of a smaller number than 40.” But 50 would be a great number, and the cost would be 10,000*l.*

The Rev. Prebendary LYNE.—I have great pleasure, my Lord, in seconding the motion.

The Rev. ROBERT HENRY FORTESCUE.—I wish to ask the Rev. Chancellor whether pupil teachers will be admissible to the College, who are in schools not under the inspection of the Government ? From local circumstances the school of a very important parish is precluded either from assistance or inspection, yet we have very properly qualified pupils.

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—Certainly we take not only those

who are not pupil teachers, but, by a special rule, we receive all pupil teachers. The teachers to whom the reverend gentleman refers are not pupil teachers, but stipendiary monitors. These are parties whom we hope ultimately to bring into the College, but we admit 15 upon the foundation distinct from pupil teachers. They are, as I have said, distinct from pupil teachers; and stipendiary monitors who have completed their apprenticeships will, upon the recommendation of the Local Board, be received upon the same terms as exhibitors. Your lads would come under the designation of exhibitors.

The Rev. ROBERT HENRY FORTESCUE.—I wish to know further, whether at present, or within what time, we may hope for certificated masters to be sent out from the present Exeter Training Institution. At present I am waiting for a master, and I probably may have to apply here.

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—I am delighted that the question has been put, because I am proud to say we have already six certificated masters.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—Would not this Resolution, especially with regard to pupil teachers, pledge us to the Government and the Government scheme?

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—It would merely pledge us in the same way that S. Mark's College at Chelsea is pledged. It would require us only to be inspected, in order to receive the grants which are paid through the medium of such inspectors. It does not bring us under the management clauses. But pardon me for referring to that topic.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—May I ask whether, having the assistance of the Government in the building of these schools, would involve us in anything like the management clause?

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—The management clauses do not refer to Training Colleges.

The LORD BISHOP.—I have put my name down as a subscriber for 100*l.* to this object, and I shall rejoice to make it annual for five years if I may humbly presume to look forward to so long a continuance of my life.

The Resolution was then put and unanimously adopted by the Synod.

SCHOOL INSPECTION.

The Rev. Henry SANDERS.—I beg leave, my Lord, to introduce a Resolution to the Synod, in reference to the present mode of inspection of our schools. I do this in the absence of one who is an oracle upon such subjects, but who, unfortunately, is not able to be here; and in consequence of his absence, there attaches to myself, very unwillingly, the duty which he would so much better have discharged. The question of inspection is one which has attracted the attention of the Diocesan Board, inasmuch as it was found to be, and was always so considered by them, one of the most essential features

in their system. It was early declared that the schools, in connexion with the Board, would never be efficient, unless the inspection was systematically and periodically carried out. For this purpose, in their earliest report, the Board say, it will be one of their first endeavours to establish an efficient system of inspection ; and they hope that the benefits derived from that inspection will be to establish a mutual good feeling for the purposes of one great common object. They say, “ they are strongly convinced, from the partial visitation of schools “ which has already been made in one of the local districts, that inspection at stated periods, conducted on one uniform principle, “ and carried on with zeal and activity, is the only means of securing “ the extension and improvement of education amongst the middle and “ lower classes, or of giving to the Diocesan and Local Boards that “ stability and extensive usefulness which might be expected from the “ union of system and of principle.” But at the same time they believe there might be, and I do not say it is unnatural, among many of the Clergy, an objection to admit an inspector into their schools, unless they were fully aware of the objects he had in view in visiting them. The Board consequently proceed to say, “ in those parishes in which “ inspection has already taken place, the inspectors have uniformly “ been received with much kindness and respect, and the greatest “ desire has been manifested on the part of the managers and masters “ of Schools to facilitate inquiry, and to establish a mutual good feeling for the purposes of one great common object.” Then they say, “ the inspectors, on their parts, have abstained from all unnecessary “ interference or control in the management and regulation of the “ different schools.” Their object was to lay down the principle that the inspectors were to visit and report upon the schools, and not to interfere with the control or management which individuals, in their own localities, might think best for their respective schools. The plan which was first adopted by the Board is stated to be a temporary plan. You will find this described in the fourteenth page of their first Annual Report. They say, “ the first business of your Committee, in “ the ensuing year, will be to consider in what manner they can best “ provide a permanent system of efficient inspection for the Schools “ brought into union with the Board. They are not prepared, at the “ present moment, to recommend any specific plan for that purpose, but “ they hope that it will be in their power to form a Committee out of “ the members of the Board, who, in conjunction with members selected “ from the Local Boards, will take upon themselves the duties of inspectors for one year. They are aware that it is a duty which must “ necessarily require much active exertion, and a great sacrifice of “ time, on the part of those members who undertake it ; but, at the “ same time, as it will afford to such members a personal knowledge of “ the transactions of the Local Boards, and of the state of education in “ each particular district, that task must be one of the greatest pleasure and satisfaction, which will enable them to ascertain for themselves the exact points in which the Schools for the poor and the “ middle classes are the most defective, and to consider the best means

“ of supplying to them the great blessings of sound religious and industrial education. *Whether or not a system of paid inspection may be hereafter required*, is a subject which they feel the less reluctance in postponing, from its having come to their knowledge, that communications are still pending between the Government and the National Society ; but they trust, by the plan above suggested, they shall be able, at the next annual meeting, to bring the whole state of education throughout the Diocese before the Board, with that degree of accuracy which their present inquiries have not enabled them to attain.” The arrangement, therefore, was to be for one year ; and they express a confident hope that, before the next meeting of the Board, they shall be enabled to have arranged some efficient system. They say they are not prepared to recommend such a system, but they express an earnest hope that no long time will elapse before they are. But it happens that no well-arranged plan has yet been agreed upon. The temporary arrangement then made is the one which, with slight modifications, has been carried on to this moment ; and it is with a view to improve upon the present plan, as far as we can, that I am now bringing the question of the inspection of our schools before the Synod. I will state what the present plan is, and endeavour to point out the difficulties in, and objections to, it ; and I will conclude with moving a Resolution which, at all events, will open the subject, and be the commencement, I hope, of a better plan for this great purpose. The present plan embraces two classes of inspection—Diocesan inspection and Local inspection. The Local Inspectors are appointed by the Local Boards ; and they are of great use, inasmuch as from their knowledge of the particular locality, they can render assistance to the Diocesan Board, and to the Diocesan Inspector, when he pays his visit. The Diocesan Inspectors are appointed only by the Board in Exeter, and I can assure the Synod that the difficulty and labour of obtaining such Inspectors is uniformly great. This duty devolves entirely upon the Honorary Secretary to the Board, who, I cannot but take this opportunity of saying, has, in the midst of multifarious occupations, devoted an enormous amount of time and trouble to carry out the object of the Training School. The mode in which he proceeds is this : he is obliged to write letters all over the Diocese to the respective Local Boards, that they should name individuals whom they may think would be fitting and likely to lend their assistance in the object of inspection. It is obvious that he cannot have the proper acquaintance with all the districts in the Diocese to enable him to select himself, and it is obvious, too, that many to whom he writes may object. An enormous amount of writing, consequently, devolves upon him. As a proof of the difficulty he has in obtaining the names of efficient inspectors, I may mention that it is only in the last week he has been enabled to fill up the requisite lists, which ought to have been promulgated in the first month of the year. This is one of the first difficulties we are endeavouring to counteract. The next difficulty is that, as the Report says, the inspection should be at stated periods, and that a system of con-

ducting it upon one uniform principle should be devised ; but at present, the inspection is not carried on at stated periods, but only at such times as are most convenient to the inspector who undertakes the duty. The consequence is, that if the inspection happens to clash in point of time with the Government Inspection, the Managers of the Schools express themselves rather annoyed at having to submit their schools to another examination as soon as the Government Inspectors have finished theirs. This we propose to obviate. The next point is, that of an uniform principle of inspection. There are certain papers communicated to the various Inspectors by the Diocesan Board ; but these papers are not full ; they are chiefly confined to statistical information ; and they do not present to the mind of the inspector any one uniform principle of conducting the examination. This, we think, is another defect, and, after great deliberation, we propose the adoption of certain papers which we think will admit all the objects we deem necessary for the establishment of an uniform and systematic principle of examination and inspection throughout the Diocese. Here, again, it so happens, that in the district in which I fulfil the duties of Diocesan Inspector, I have found a great disinclination, upon the part of the Clergy of my district, to admit me into their schools at all ; they would rather conduct their schools upon their own principles, and so on. Now I wish to read this one passage, in order to show how very carefully the Diocesan Board, in forming their rules and regulations, have endeavoured to prevent any such jealousy, suspicion, or disinclination on the part of the respective Managers of Schools. I am speaking now of Visitation ; and in the fifty-first page of the Report for 1839 it is said—

“ The *first* step should be to request the Clergy, and those of the laity who support such schools, to place them in connexion with the Board, for the purpose of general information and mutual improvement ; the *second*, to request them to receive a Visitor properly appointed : but this should on no account be pressed : the advantage of inspection will soon be apparent wherever it is tried, and its introduction must be more or less gradual.”

It is then added—

“ The Clergyman of the parish is of course the natural and constant inspector of all schools connected with the Church, and except in the case of a legal Visitor of a Trust, no visitation should be attempted without his consent, or the authority of the Bishop. But when this can be obtained, the Board, in order to ensure frequent and regular visits by persons acquainted with *local circumstances*, may appoint two examiners, of whom their Secretary will probably be one, the head-master of a Grammar School, or some one well versed in the details of practical teaching, may be another. They should undertake to visit every School in the district once or twice in each year. As soon as arrangements can be made for the purpose, it will be desirable that an Inspector should also be appointed by the Diocesan Board to act in concert with the local Visitors. Reports of the number and state of the Schools in union within the district, together

“with such general information on the subject of education as may be desirable, should be transmitted half-yearly by the Local, to the Diocesan Board.”

And then it goes on to other matters. I think, however, that these passages will show how distinctly the Diocesan Board recognise the authority of the Clergy, and acknowledge that no Visitor has authority to introduce himself without the consent of the parochial Clergyman. I will not detain the Synod any longer upon this subject, but proceed to trace the system by which we propose to obviate these difficulties. First, as to the appointment of Diocesan inspectors. In order to relieve the honorary secretary of the Board from the great difficulty and labour which he now undergoes, the Board are obliged to ask for the assistance of the Venerable the Archdeacons of the Diocese. After much deliberation and thought they cannot devise any better plan than this; and I propose to move, as a formal Resolution upon this point,—

2. “(2.) That on any vacancy occurring in the number of Diocesan inspectors, whether clerical or lay, the Archdeacons of the respective Archdeaconries be requested by the Diocesan Board to recommend to them proper persons, to whom the Board may make application for their consent to act as Inspectors.”

It is hoped that, from the knowledge which the Archdeacons may have of the characters and of the fitting qualifications of Clergymen, that they will be enabled, without much difficulty, to select and name to the Diocesan Board, such as will readily undertake this very responsible and important office. The next point to be considered is the establishment of something like an uniform system. I need not trouble the Synod by saying more on this subject than that the papers which contain the system [produced] will be laid before it. There are three papers; they are rather long, and I do not suppose I shall be asked to read all the particulars in them; but they shall lie upon the table. They have been prepared, as I have intimated, in the hope of establishing an uniform and systematic plan of inspection throughout the whole Diocese. The next thing after this is, that we should have stated periods of inspection, in order not to clash with the inspection of the Government: and the fourth, that we should have what I have sometimes found would be exceedingly advantageous to us—a more direct and express authority from the Bishop, to show that it is with his sanction, and under his authority, that the Diocesan inspectors visit the respective schools in the Diocese. There is but one other point to which I wish to advert. Certainly in the early report of the Diocesan Board, which I hold in my hand, there is an allusion to the great advantage which would be derived from the system of paid inspection. In some respects it is obvious that a paid inspection would ensure uniformity of system, and other advantages which are too marked to need pointing out; but I will dismiss this subject with this observation, that after the most attentive consideration which the Board could give to it, however desirable they may think it, or however more efficient they may be convinced a system

of paid inspection would be, yet, at present, the greatest possible advantages having been derived from the present voluntary system, where mutual confidence has been raised between the Diocesan Board and the respective schools in the respective parishes, there is an insurmountable objection to be overcome. It is one which the Board cannot get over in any way; and it is just this, that we have no money, and can get none. Consequently this, in a very short and summary way, is the answer we have to make to any proposal which may proceed from any individual, that we should avail ourselves of the great advantage of a paid inspection. With these observations I beg to move the Resolution I have just read.

The Rev. Dr. CORNISH.—I have much pleasure, my Lord, in seconding the Resolution. I can speak from my own experience of the difficulty which has been felt in keeping up an efficient system of inspection; but, at the same time, having filled the office of Inspector myself, I must say that I have never experienced any difficulty in obtaining admission to schools conducted by my reverend brethren, although upon one or two occasions we have been refused admission to schools under lay assistance. Still I concur with my reverend friend, Mr. Sanders, that it is extremely desirable that the inspectors should go armed with more explicit authority from your lordship than they possess at present.

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—If it is really believed that the Diocesan Inspectors do not go forth with your Lordship's sanction, that may be some reason why so many refuse admission into their Schools; but the fact is, that every Diocesan Inspector is now sanctioned by your Lordship in writing. With regard to inspection, I must take the liberty of saying that by the present mode we cannot effect what we wish. I must add, that the Diocesan Board appoints the Inspectors. I do not. But, of course, considerable difficulty will be avoided by this Resolution, because under it, instead of our guessing whom we should appoint, we shall have the assistance of the Archdeacons in recommending proper parties.

The Rev. ROBERT HENRY FORTESCUE.—Permit me, my Lord, to express the hope, that, notwithstanding what has been said, the Diocesan Board will not altogether give up the idea of appointing paid Diocesan Inspectors—one for each county if possible, but certainly one for the whole Diocese. Some years ago, I was myself an Inspector; and I know how the Inspectors are appointed. Under the present system, the appointment does not necessarily fall upon the persons who are most qualified, but upon those who are most willing to undertake the office. In some deaneries it may so happen that there are clergy gifted with the great qualities necessary to enable them to discharge the duties of inspectors efficiently. It is not necessary that a Clergyman should be gifted with all such qualifications, for the discharge of his ordinary parochial duties; but it is necessary, in order to see if a School is properly conducted in its daily routine that he should be a thoroughly good plain Catechist. Having been an inspector, I have been conscious of very great deficiencies in myself;

and I have consequently, this year, declined to take the office in my own deanery, although requested by the Dean rural. I have, too, observed very great differences in the qualifications for useful inspection. I remember being present at a late inspection by your Lordship's own examining Chaplain, Mr. Woolcombe, and I cannot too much admire the efficient mode in which he conducted it. I feel confident, then, that if one or two inspectors were appointed for the Diocese, the inspection of the schools, and consequently the education given in them, would be ten times more advantageous than it is at present; and if a separate and distinct fund were opened for the special payment of such inspector or inspectors (who should receive from 200*l.* to 300*l.* a-year), I think a sufficient number of subscribers might be found to fill up the amount. Under these convictions I cannot but express a hope that the Diocesan Board will not altogether give up the contemplation of a paid inspection.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—I venture to recommend, and I am sure that many of my reverend brethren will respond to it, that we should subscribe to such a fund throughout the Diocese.

The Rev. HINDS HOWELL.—I may be allowed, perhaps, to suggest a plan, in relation to this subject, which was advantageously adopted some twelve or thirteen years ago, when I was in the Diocese of Lincoln. It was that every school which placed itself in connexion with the Diocesan Board for the purpose of inspection, also agreed to pay so much towards the expense from the School funds. By adopting that mode here you will at once obtain a fund, or the nucleus of a fund, by means of which the inspection may be carried on with much greater advantage by one or two inspectors for the whole district, who shall be paid, than by one in each District acting voluntarily. By the appointment of one or two paid inspectors for the whole Diocese you will be at once enabled to see what schools are well conducted, and how they are well conducted, and to derive the advantages of uniformity, which, under smaller spheres of inspection could not, perhaps, be altogether expected.

The Rev. Prebendary HOLE.—Who assessed the payments by the different Schools?

The Rev. HINDS HOWELL.—The Bishop of the Diocese. This was part of the terms of the union. Each School was to pay one guinea a-year for this purpose: and for that small sum they ensured that the School was under the inspection of the Diocesan Board.

The LORD BISHOP.—This, my reverend brethren, is a very important communication.

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—But, at the same time, we must not forget the debt of gratitude which is due to the able gentlemen who have for the last eleven years voluntarily conducted the inspection of the schools in this Diocese. I believe that in general their inspection has been most efficient. There are, however, places where there has been no inspection. We could not get an inspector in the district of the local board of Tavistock. Last year, I applied, and met with every kindness from one individual, and some of the schools were inspected, but he took it only upon the condition that he should

partially inspect them. This year I could get no inspector at all. There are five local boards where there are no inspectors ; and therefore it may be said that the inspection under the local boards is inefficient ; but at the same time there are now upwards of thirty inspectors, in different parts of the Diocese, who have done, who are doing, and who will do, their work quite as well as any paid inspector.

The Rev. REGINALD HOBHOUSE.—I do not think that the system of Diocesan inspection need, necessarily, exclude us from the advantages of local inspection. The two, I conceive, may be combined ; and it seems to me that if they were, the work would be better done. The Diocesan inspector would certainly do his work better if he had the local clergyman working and acting with him. It is clearly an object of some importance that the person who inspects the schools should have local as well as general knowledge ; and that advantage appears to me to be obtained by the system of local inspection. I think it is exceedingly useful for a clergyman now and then to see the inside of his neighbour's schools ; but that advantage, I think, would be lost if local inspection were given up and the Diocesan system adopted exclusively.

The Rev. WILLIAM KARSLAKE.—With regard to the principle of a paid inspection, I must be permitted to say that I fear great difficulty will be found in calling upon poor and small parishes where there are no fixed funds for school purposes. I have myself two schools supported entirely gratuitously ; but the funds at my disposal are very inadequate to make them such schools as I could wish them to be. They are inspected yearly by the local inspector, and have received their approbation ; but they could not, and I do not think that many schools would, afford any outlay for paid inspection.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—Are there at present any lay inspectors ?

The Rev. Chancellor HARRINGTON.—There is a lay Diocesan inspector. That has always been the case since the foundation of the Board.

The Rev. ARTHUR TATHAM.—By permission of the Ruri-Decanal Chapter of the district to which I belong, I had intended to bring under the consideration of the Synod the subject of a permanent and regular system of inspection. But it has been undertaken by abler hands. I quite concur in the description which has been given of the labour imposed upon Mr. Chancellor Harrington in finding inspectors ; and I must say that in our district we are ready ourselves to undertake it. But having been connected with the local Board from the commencement of the system, I must say, from experience, that the great difficulty is not in the quality of the inspection. We may obtain in the first or second year men admirably adapted for the purpose ; but we feel the difficulty of the want of a continuous system. In one year an inspector is appointed to the duty, but it is impossible he can continue to discharge it, owing to the labour which is required from him in his own parish. Thus it becomes utterly impossible that a continuous system of inspection can be carried on as far as it is desirable. I, therefore, strongly concur in all that has been said respecting the need of some permanent system of inspection. At the same time I fully agree with Mr. Hobhouse as to the advantages to arise from con-

necting the Diocesan with the local inspector. The following is a copy of the Resolution which we adopted on this subject at our Rural Synod.

"That this Chapter, feeling the necessity of a duly organized system of inspection, do earnestly recommend the appointment by the Bishop of permanent inspectors, whose time may be wholly devoted to the work."

The means by which this plan may be carried out, I shall not venture to suggest ; but I think the plan itself is most important.

The LORD BISHOP.—These are matters so closely affecting our ministry, that they cannot be too fully or maturely considered ; and my Clergy will always find me perfectly desirous of giving the fullest consideration to them.

The Resolution was then carried unanimously.

The Rev. HENRY SANDERS.—Then the next Resolution I have to propose will be, that the three forms which I have laid upon the table, are fit and proper forms to be put into the hands of the Diocesan inspectors, for the purpose of ensuring a uniform inspection throughout the Diocese.

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON. — There is already a Resolution upon the books, passed in Committee, to this effect : "That the plan of inspection by Diocesan inspectors be recommended to the General Board for adoption, excepting where the clergyman and managers may adopt some other arrangement." This Resolution has been adopted, but not carried out, on account of the difficulty of it. Last year a scheme was sent down to the Board, and we have been gathering returns from different places so as to improve these papers. And these are the last sent down by the National Society to me about a week ago—in them we have made a few alterations.

The Rev. WILLIAM KARSLAKE.—Might not the difficulty be met, by the Synod simply expressing its confidence in the management of the Diocesan Board ?

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—It is clear that all that we can do is simply to communicate to the Diocesan Board that this Synod have approved of certain papers. Any communication from any local board, or any gentleman will, of course, be received by them, and considered ; but it will certainly be a very great support to the Diocesan Board if the Synod approve of these papers.

The LORD BISHOP.—Then it will be necessary that they should be considered, because, in that case, it will not be taken as a matter of confidence, but of approbation after examination. The papers can be printed and the question be taken into consideration to-morrow, if it is thought better not to propose it as a matter of confidence ; for, if the Board in Exeter asks for the sanction of the Synod in order to strengthen their hands, that sanction can only be given upon examination.

The Rev. WILLIAM KARSLAKE.—I beg to state that I feel the utmost confidence in the Managers of the Diocesan Training College ; and I would leave it to them to frame such questions for the guidance of their examiners as they may deem most suitable for that purpose. If such a Resolution is considered sufficient I will move it.

The Rev. JOHN NUTCOMBE GOULD.—And I will second it.

The LORD BISHOP.—I am glad to say that the Rev. Chancellor Harington tells me that would be sufficient for the purposes of the Board. There is a clear advantage in the proposition assuming that shape, inasmuch as it becomes, distinctly, a vote of confidence in the Diocesan Board ; whereas in the other case, we are only called upon to approve a particular paper.

It was then unanimously resolved—

3. (3.) “That the Synod has such confidence in the Diocesan Board of Education that they are ready to entrust to them the task of framing papers for the guidance of Diocesan School Inspectors.”

The Rev. HENRY SANDERS.—There is another subject connected with inspection, to which I think it is necessary to call the attention of the Synod. The Diocesan Inspectors have now the authority of the Bishop ; but that authority does not seem so clearly expressed as it might be in order to carry with it its due weight. It is, therefore, the object of the Resolution I am about to propose, to ask the Lord Bishop respectfully to grant the inspectors more direct and express authority for their inspection. I beg, then, to move, “That the Diocesan Inspectors be provided with more direct authority from the Bishop for the purposes of inspectors in their respective schools.” It is, however, suggested by a reverend friend, that the district or local Inspectors should be armed with similar powers.

The LORD BISHOP.—I shall be very glad to give the same sanction to the Local Inspectors.

The Rev. HENRY SANDERS.—Then, my Lord, with your Lordship's permission, I will move the Resolution in the following words :

4. (4.) “That the Synod rejoices to find that the Bishop is in the habit of giving his sanction to the Diocesan Inspectors ; and is glad now to hear that the same sanction will be extended to the Local Inspectors.”

The Resolution was seconded.

The Rev. Prebendary WOOLLCOMBE.—With regard to inspectors, I may mention that I have heard of many who have gone to several schools for a considerable period, and found them in the same state, as regards improvement, as when they first went ; so that they came away disgusted with their visit. I must add, that I felt this myself to a great extent when I first began to undertake the office of inspector, ten or eleven years ago. But within the last four years we have adopted the plan of sending, about six months before our visit, a list of the subjects in which we should make our examination, to the clergy or the schoolmaster, in order that they might be enabled to prepare their scholars. The advantages of this practice have been exceedingly great. We find it stimulates the children, the masters, the clergyman, and all connected with the school. In fact I think it is the very life of the inspection, for I do not see why we should not extend to the schools of the poor the same system that we apply to our own schools. In our colleges there are certain subjects prepared in which candidates are to be examined ; and the same system ought, in my judgment, to

be applied to the instruction of the poor. We find the system to be exceedingly liked by the masters. In our several visits we have put written questions to the masters as regards the benefits of inspection, and from many of them we have received written answers, which are referred to in our reports. I do not wish to move any Resolution upon this point, because one has been already passed by, and is upon the books of the Diocesan Board; but I should wish to direct attention to it in order that the subject may be discussed among ourselves, and acted upon by the inspectors, in the ensuing and following years.

The Resolution was unanimously carried.

The Rev. Prebendary WOOLLCOMBE.—Connected with this subject of the inspection of schools, I have a Resolution to propose in relation to the examination of masters and mistresses of Church schools, who would be willing to offer themselves for such examination in order to hold certificates of merit from the Bishop. The inspection of the schools, at the periodical visits of the inspectors, stimulates the children to a great extent; but I do not think we have yet accorded sufficient stimulus to their masters and mistresses to advance in their studies. The Government system affords the most exciting stimulus for masters and mistresses, in those schools where pupil teachers and stipendiary monitors are apprenticed, advancing in their studies; and, in the course of a few years, we shall find the masters and mistresses of those schools which have not the Government inspection, far outstripped by those who have had such stimulus afforded to them. It is therefore perfectly wise on our part, as Churchmen, to do the same to the Church schools under us, and to afford the like advantages to the masters and mistresses, who have expressed a desire for them, by affording to them all the assistance of such a stimulus. I will not, however, occupy more of your time upon the subject, but at once read the details. But I should say, at first, that I have so organized the details that there should be three classes of certificates granted. The principles upon which we should conduct the examination are these:—

Details of a Plan of Examination of Masters and Mistresses of Church Schools in the Diocese of Exeter, who are willing to offer themselves for that purpose, in order to hold Certificates of Merit from the Bishop.

I. The Certificates to be granted according to a three-fold scale of merit, and to be termed—

First Class	} Certificates.
Second Class	
Third Class	

II. Subjects necessary for holding the *lowest or third class* Certificates to be as follows:—

1. A fair knowledge of the History of the Old and New Testament, and general acquaintance with the Prayer-Book.
2. An accurate knowledge of the words of the Catechism, and a fair knowledge of its meaning.

3. Penmanship and Orthography.
4. Arithmetic to Fractions inclusive.
5. Acquaintance with the elements of Geography, and of English History.
6. Ability to point out the parts of speech in a sentence.

FOR MISTRESSES—

- 1, 2, 3, and 6, as above.

Arithmetic, first four rules; simple and compound.

Some acquaintance with elements of Geography.

III. Subjects necessary for holding the *second Certificate* :—

1. A more complete knowledge of the History of the Old and New Testament.
2. A knowledge of the contents of the Prayer-Book, and ability to illustrate the Catechism by passages from Holy Scripture.
3. Arithmetic, including Decimal Fractions, Interest, Practice, Proportion—single and double.
4. Further acquaintance with general Geography, especially Palestine and England.
5. The construction of sentences and Syntax.
6. Further acquaintance with English History, and some knowledge of the leading events of Church History.
7. Some examination in practical School-keeping.
8. Music, where possible.

FOR MISTRESSES—

- 1, 2, 4, 7.

Arithmetic, to Practice and Interest, inclusive.

IV. Subjects necessary for holding the highest or *first class Certificate* :—

1. More accurate and complete knowledge of some *given* portion of the Old and New Testament, including its chronology.
2. Ability to prove the Catechism and Prayer-Book from Holy Scripture, and to elucidate the doctrine contained therein.
3. Acquaintance with some approved treatise on Arithmetic—Mensuration. Mapping—Navigation, elements of.
4. Geography of Scripture in general, and of Great Britain and its Colonies.
5. Etymology and English Composition.
6. More accurate knowledge of English History, and Church History, and of our own Church in particular.
7. A composition on the management of a School, or the practical duties of a Teacher.
8. A higher acquaintance with Music.

FOR MISTRESSES—

- 1, 2, 4.

Some knowledge of English and Church History.

Arithmetic, to Fractions and Proportion.

V. The masters and mistresses of all Church schools be invited to offer themselves, whether in union with the Diocesan Board or not, with the National Society or not, whether receiving inspection or not, provided they have been in their present situation for one year, and on producing the following testimonials :—

1. A certificate from the Clergyman of the parish of good character, and of being communicants.
2. A certificate from the Clergyman and from the Diocesan Inspector (if inspected) of the efficient state of the School.
3. In the case of Mistresses, in addition to the above, a testimonial as to capability to teach needlework.

Perhaps it may be asked whether there are schoolmasters and mistresses in the Diocese who would be willing to offer themselves for such an examination. Should none such be found, of course the whole scheme will fall to the ground ; but when we remember the gratifying fact that twelve months ago, between one and two hundred schoolmasters in the Diocese presented an address to the Bishop expressing their concurrence in the doctrine of the Church, especially upon the great question that has been discussed this morning, we may safely say that great numbers of them would be willing to hold a certificate of merit from your Lordship, which would reflect credit upon them, and to which they would look back with the highest pleasure and delight during the rest of their lives. To show the importance of this step being adopted I may mention one or two simple facts. There were in 1850, in this Diocese, 351 schools that were inspected in that year. Of these, 67 were under Government inspection, leaving the large proportion of 284 under Diocesan inspection—they being, consequently, schools which had not that stimulus for exertion on the part of the master to which I have just referred. There are more than 700 parishes in Devon and Cornwall. Of this number only 147 are under Government inspection in respect to education ; leaving 586 not under that advantage, and in the schools of which the masters and mistresses have not the benefit of that stimulus to which I have already called attention. Of course we must deduct from those 586 a large number of schools now carried on by dames, a great many of whom, no doubt, would feel unwilling to offer themselves as candidates for these certificates ; but certainly I think that out of the 586 we might calculate upon at least 100 who would be willing to take it at once. Under these circumstances I beg to propose—

5. (5.) “That a proposal be made to the several masters and mistresses of Church schools in the diocese, that they offer themselves for examination in order to hold certificates of merit from the Bishop, and that the details now submitted be referred to the Diocesan Board for their consideration.”

The Rev. HINDS HOWELL seconded the Resolution.

It was next resolved, on the motion of the Rev. Chancellor HARRINGTON, seconded by the Rev. Sub-Dean STEPHENS—

6. (6.) “That the several Resolutions adopted this day by the Synod, having reference to the Diocesan Board, be transmitted to the General Committee, with a request that the best attention of the Board be directed to the matters contained therein.”

APPOINTMENT OF A PAID INSPECTOR.

The Rev. ISAAC HENRY GOSSET proposed—

7. (7.) “That it is, in the opinion of the Synod, highly desirable that at least one Paid Inspector be appointed for the Diocese, to co-operate with the Diocesan and Local Inspectors.”

The Rev. DR. COLERIDGE seconded the Resolution.

The Rev. RICHARD MARTIN.—I wish, my Lord, to express my full

and complete concurrence with the opinion that there should be one or two paid inspectors of the schools in the Diocese ; at the same time I do not agree that this should be a separate and distinct office. The person who is charged with the inspection of the Diocesan schools ought to stand in a high position in the Diocese. I think, therefore, that the Synod might very properly petition the Church Commission to restore one of the stalls in the cathedral that have been suppressed, for the express purpose of promoting education in the Diocese. The Government are undoubtedly anxious to promote education, a circumstance which seems to me a legitimate reason for petitioning, (if there is any use in it,) that at least one stall should be restored for this most important purpose.

The LORD BISHOP.—That is a very important suggestion, and one which I should be delighted to be able to look upon with the least particle of hope. I am sorry to say that actual experience of the discussions in the Ecclesiastical Commission, while the Act was going through Parliament as a Bill, convinces me that it would be utterly hopeless to attempt to get another canonry reserved in this Church. I am perfectly certain also, that there would be very little chance of obtaining it elsewhere. In the first place, I do not think we should get it brought forward in Parliament with that spirit which would alone give it a chance of success. Still, I confess, this office does appear to me to be one which invites the suggestion, that it be attached to one of the stalls which are to be retained. (Of course, I do not mean, that it be imposed on any individual now holding a Canonry.) This, indeed, was one of the suggestions of one of the best friends of the Church,—best, because he is anxious to see the Church in its highest state of usefulness as a Church,—I mean that excellent churchman, Mr. Sidney Herbert. He proposes—and being devotedly attached to the Church, and eager to see all her institutions, as institutions, made available for the spiritual good of the people, his opinion is most valuable—that great duties should be attached to those situations which are now very mistakenly, but very commonly, believed to be absolute sinecures. One of the great objects he has put forward in his excellent letter is, to make the inspection of schools in our several dioceses the special business of one of the residentiaries. If a petition is proposed from this body, that might be suggested in it ; but I will only venture to throw out one consideration, which, however, I shall be glad to find this Synod thinks an useless scruple. We are to recollect that this is the first occasion of a Diocesan Synod having sat in England now for nearly two centuries. We are to recollect that though we have, thank God, gone on to what has been called an experiment—very properly so called—in hope and in faith, we have not gone on to it without the experience of opposition from quarters which we highly respect, and from which we should be very sorry to court further hostility. Now, I venture to think that this Synod, petitioning in the character of a Synod, might be considered, in the present state of mind of a very large portion of at least one house of Parliament, as assuming that we have more of good-will from that body towards

us than we have yet felt to be the case. I have no doubt, however, that that time will come ; and, thank God, my confidence is increased by the experience of the proceedings of this day,—not merely by the unanimous Resolution we have come to in relation to the great purpose of our meeting, but also by the eminently useful suggestions we have had this day upon a subject of the greatest importance to our ministry—I mean, education. The good sense, the moderation, the temper, with which the whole proceedings of the Synod have been conducted is, at once, an assurance to the country, if they choose to receive such an assurance, that Synods like this are likely to be the means under God of greatly promoting the spiritual good of those whose spiritual interests are entrusted to us. I think, therefore, that the very fact of our discussing this point, is a large recommendation of the measure ; and perhaps likely to be a more useful way of recommending it than by a formal petition from the Synod, for I think we might thereby create adverse remark, and seem as if we were assuming a position which I am quite sure we do not desire to assume.

The Resolution was then carried unanimously.

The Rev. JOHN C. D. YULE.—I wish to offer one or two observations with reference to schools for the poor. There is no one difficulty that meets a parochial clergyman of so much magnitude as that of providing schools for the poor in small agricultural parishes. I have no substantive Resolution to propose upon this subject, but I hope the Diocesan Board will, as soon as they can, bring their attention bear upon this point. I hope they will furnish us with information which will enable us to carry out an object which is extremely desirable, especially in small rural parishes—the establishment of a school in each parish for the poor. In many small parishes we are totally without funds to establish schools, or we have none in which to take charge of the poor, except dame schools, which, at this advanced period, are not what we ought to trust to. The point then is, to know whether sufficient exertion is making by the Diocesan Committee in respect to schools for the poor in small agricultural parishes.

The Rev. Chancellor HARRINGTON.—I believe that that to which my reverend friend Mr. Yule refers should be done by the Local Boards. It is part of their province, and not part of the province of the Diocesan Board. We wish to work through the Local Boards ; and, the more active they become the better for the Diocesan Board. All my reverend friend's observations are of great importance, because they may, perhaps, resuscitate some of those Boards which have, of late, been rather dull. With regard to funds, I beg to remind the Synod that the Diocesan Board never had any means to expend upon local schools. We have a few subscribers in our own locality, and parties at a distance do not subscribe to us directly : they do it by their Local Boards. If, therefore, we pass a Resolution, that the Local Boards should consider the advantage of expending their money upon their own localities, the intent to make them as assistants and adjuncts to the Training College will clearly fail.

The Rev. JOHN NUTCOMBE GOULD.—I am a member of a Local Board, and I can truly say that we have done very little indeed. It is hardly possible, with all the activity of our acting Secretary, to get a meeting; and I beg to say that I do feel exceedingly confident, agreeing with the observations which have fallen from the Chancellor, that our funds would be better distributed, that they would be distributed with more unity of purpose, and the object be better considered, if much more were left to the Diocesan Board by the Local Boards.

The Rev. Prebendary LUNEY.—I object to the Resolution proposed, because it implies that all the poverty and all the difficulty lays in the agricultural districts. My lot has fallen in a town district, and I must say that I have had quite as much difficulty in establishing a school for the two important parishes of Kingsbridge and Dodsbrook as any clergyman can have had in strictly agricultural parishes. We should hardly have obtained our master, but for the personal liberality of the Chancellor himself; and it is through him we have a master so well trained as the individual whom we have secured. All the schools contemplated by the Diocesan Board in their returns are poor schools, whether they be in town or rural districts. I therefore object to the Resolution, upon the simple ground that it goes to recognise a distinction which, residing as I do in a town district, I do not find to exist.

The Rev. JOHN THOMAS PINE COFFIN.—This subject is of the greatest importance to the particular part of the Diocese with which I am connected. There is there a very great want, not only of funds for the establishment of schools, but also, when we have established them, of masters and mistresses to carry on the work of education. Without drawing, or wishing to draw, a distinction between town and country populations, I cannot help thinking we are, in this respect, worse off than they are in places where there is a larger population. Where there is a large population, people are naturally drawn where they can receive a good education. I should be exceedingly sorry if anything occurred here to create any feeling between the town and country populations, or to do anything but that which, as a Christian community, we should wish to see done; but, having been now for twenty-five years the officiating minister of one parish, I cannot but see the great want we labour under. With regard to the particular fact of the want of masters and mistresses to schools, it is brought so prominently forward before us upon every occasion, that, unless something be adopted by the Local Boards to enable them to furnish them to those who require them, our funds will be much injured. Under these circumstances, I feel I should have been departing from my duty to those who sent me here, if I had maintained silence upon a question of so much importance.

The Rev. W. KARSLAKE.—Would not the object be attained by requesting the Local Boards to turn their particular attention to the education of the poor; and report their observations thereon to the Diocesan Board?

The LORD BISHOP.—The Chancellor will be able to tell us whether,

under the existing regulations of the Board, there is not already some provision upon that subject?

The Rev. Chancellor HARRINGTON.—Yes, my Lord. In the 56th page of the First Report of the Diocesan Board, the objects contemplated in the formation of the Local Boards are divided into four classes. The first is, to diffuse the earliest, best, and plainest information on the subject of a sound education on Church principles throughout the whole district. The next is, to organize a system of collecting subscriptions and donations, partly to meet the necessary expenses of the Local Boards, and partly to give aid to the Diocesan Board in furtherance of its general designs.

It being now time for Even-song in the Cathedral, the Synod adjourned till after service, Mr. Yonge's Resolution having been formally withdrawn.

The Synod reassembled at four o'clock, when—

The LORD BISHOP said,—If there is any other matter to be discussed relative to Education, now is the time to bring it forward.

The Rev. JOHN GAY COPLESTON.—As a member of a Local Board, I feel that according to the rule which has been read, it is our first duty to supply funds to the Diocesan Board for the furtherance of its general designs in the spread of education; but at the same time, we cannot be insensible to the pressing claims of many of the poorer Clergy around us. I must beg to say there is a great distinction between the urban and the rural Clergy. In country parishes there are no materials to work with, and we feel the extreme difficulty of our position in this respect. As to my own small parish, I never think of calling upon the Local Board for any support; but there are many Clergy who are not in the same position; and we feel the difficulty of supplying the pressing claims of those around us. Notwithstanding this, we have adhered to the first great principle which has been laid down. Under these circumstances, and believing that some expression of sympathy with the rural Clergy will strengthen the hands of the Local Boards, I beg to move—

“That this Synod, at the same time that it fully acknowledges it “to be the first object of the Diocesan Board to train able masters for “the Diocese in general, especially the towns, thinks that consideration “is also due to the rural districts; and believes the Committee to “be anxious to meet the peculiar difficulties of the Clergy in remote “rural districts, and to provide suitable masters as far as is consistent “with their first great object.”

The Rev. Chancellor HARRINGTON.—The fact is, this is done. We do provide masters and mistresses for schools in the rural districts.

The Rev. JOHN GAY COPLESTON.—I am only anxious for this Resolution as an expression of sympathy, because their subscriptions will be withdrawn.

The Rev. HINDS HOWELL.—Then they will be withdrawn without cause. We have now 136 pupil-teachers in the Diocese; this time twelvemonths we shall have as many more, and in ten years it is

hardly possible to say the number. Of course those who are educated to take pupil-teachers must be competent for the Government Certificates. There will then be so many, that they will be glad to take the rural districts; and our Diocesan School educates them for rural parishes.

The Rev. JOHN GAY COPLESTON.—The Board at Honiton has been distinguished for its support of the Diocesan Board; and I think there should be some expression of sympathy with the rural districts.

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—The only ground upon which I object to the Resolution is, that it is superfluous.

The Rev. ROBERT HENRY FORTESCUE.—I think that by a Resolution of this kind we shall be placing the Diocesan Board in a predicament that may be unpleasant to them. These are matters which ought to be left to them, and I think that the vote of confidence which has been passed by the Synod should be held to comprehend all that the Resolution expresses. Under present circumstances it is absolutely necessary that masters should be so far educated as to avail themselves of the Government grant, otherwise they will go where they can be educated. Consequently, though some of the masters may appear to be educated too much for the rural districts, yet it is necessary to have the best educated men in every parish, for I believe that a person who is highly educated is far better able to instruct youth than one whose education is defective. With regard to another point—the imputation of neglecting small rural parishes. I myself feel that it is totally impossible for the Diocesan Board to assist in erecting school houses, or to provide schools in country parishes. A word of defence may also be spoken for the Local Boards, for I do not believe it is possible for them to erect schools; and I am sure that no motion should be brought forward which should tend to divert from the Training Schools that assistance which the Local Boards are able to render. I have had some experience in erecting schools, both in town and country, and I believe that this object can only be carried out by acts of individual munificence; that the only way in which Local Boards can exert themselves to obtain means for the erection of schools in country parishes, is by endeavouring to use their secular influence, or whatever influence they may have, with wealthy persons in the neighbourhood. I will, after these observations, conclude by simply expressing my hope that the Synod will negative the Resolution.

The Rev. JOHN GAY COPLESTON.—My Resolution was proposed rather in sympathy with the Diocesan Board, under the conviction that they were anxious to build such schools, but were unable. But, of course, if such is the feeling of the Synod, I will immediately withdraw the proposition. Still, I think, if the reverend gentleman who spoke last were in our position, he would find it totally impossible to obtain subscriptions, and that many Clergymen absolutely support the school themselves.

The Resolution was, by consent of the Synod, then withdrawn.

The Rev. JOHN C. D. YULE moved—

“That the attention of the Diocesan Board, and, through their in-

“fluence, the attention of all the Local Boards, be drawn to the want of masters calculated to suit the wants of small and poor parishes, with the view of remedying the great evil arising from a want of the class who will accept the salaries which can generally be raised in such localities.”

The Rev. JOHN THOMAS PINE COFFIN seconded the Resolution.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—I should entertain the strongest objections to that Resolution, first upon the ground of its being utterly impracticable. Neither the Local nor the Diocesan Board can by possibility do anything to meet the evil. It is a plain and an acknowledged one. It is simply the evil of a want of funds in a poor place. If the Diocesan Board were in a condition to give away money, they would be happy to do so ; but as they have not sufficient means to discharge the liabilities they have already taken upon themselves, I think it is impracticable to ask them to undertake an immensely additional expense. On these grounds I hope the Resolution will be withdrawn.

In reply to a question,

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON said,—The present Training College will hold thirty pupils, but we have not thirty pupils, because the Local Boards cannot supply us with them. The question is, whether, having nineteen young men, we are to keep down their education that they take poor parishes, or enable them to take the Government Certificate.

The Rev. WILLIAM KARSLAKE.—I have sent several pupils to be trained at the Central Schools in Exeter ; and after being there three or four months, they were reported competent to take care of boys' or girls' schools in rural parishes. They were very efficient for the purpose : and one of our objects is, to ascertain whether there is the same means of educating at a moderate expense persons of that description. To take them into the House is, of course, out of the question ; but we want to have them so trained, under the auspices of the Committee, that they may be returned to us competent to be an improvement upon the Dame Schools, that have usually been our sole places of education. This, I believe, is one of the great objects which my friends Mr. Yule and Mr. Coffin have in view, and, I think, it will be found worthy of consideration.

The Rev. Chancellor HARINGTON.—Upon this point I can give a direct answer at once—namely, that in the Central Schools of Exeter, which is a distinct branch, there have been received for the last thirty years masters and mistresses, in order to impart instruction to them. They are now received there ; and they are admitted, male and female, free of all expense. They remain there for six weeks or two months, or even three months. The only condition is, that the School shall be connected with the Diocesan Board or the National Society, and that the party shall be sent by the Clergyman of the parish.

The Rev. WM. KARSLAKE.—That, I think, is a satisfactory answer.

The Rev. JOHN C. D. YULE.—Under such circumstances, then, I will withdraw the Resolution.

The Resolution was then, by leave, withdrawn.

ON CATECHISING.

The LORD BISHOP.—Now, my reverend brethren, we will go to the next subject, which is a subject of great importance. It is of great importance in itself; it is important also because it is the first of those matters on which we have to do with the actual law and rubric of the Church, namely, catechising. This is one of the class of subjects upon which I am very glad to have the opportunity of the assistance of the council of my clergy. It is one of the best things the Synod could do to recommend, what by their general experience, by their general knowledge of the state of their parishes, was likely to be the best and most effectual mode of carrying catechising into thoroughly good effect. Your Bishop may have his own opinions upon the subject, but he has not been a parochial minister now for twenty years; he has never been a parochial minister in this diocese; his ministry was in a great mining district in the North of England. Under these circumstances he is not prepared to say what may be the best practical mode of dealing with the question; therefore I do entreat your advice for my own guidance, because my guidance is necessary, inasmuch as the law of the Church, which it is my duty to execute so far as I can, is involved in the case. I venture to suppose that this Synod will not go to the length of an absolute vote, that they advise that the directions of the Rubric and the Canon be carried into entire and strict effect. I should think they would probably come rather to a vote in which they will express their own views of the way in which it can be carried practically and discreetly into effect so far as is possible. So much for an object which is expected, I may say is prescribed by the law of the Church. We must look at this matter of the law of the Church with some caution. We cannot presume to decide against its full and strict execution; but at the same time we shall probably be unwilling to commit ourselves to a recommendation of absolutely, strictly, and immediately carrying it out in all its details. I wish now, my reverend brethren, to say a few words on the importance of catechising itself. I appeal to your knowledge, which is more complete than my own on the subject, whether it is not the most efficient element in the whole of your ministry? I believe it to be so; I believe that the best catechist will generally be found the best general teacher in his own parish. I believe that the qualities which are necessary for a good catechist are of no common kind; but I also believe that they are qualities which can be attained by attention and practice; and I believe if the clergy would give themselves very specially to the consideration of the best and most effective mode of catechising, they will have the satisfaction of finding that they improve as catechists; and I shall be forgiven if I add, I am quite sure that no one who has improved as a catechist will fail to see that he has also improved in his own knowledge of the great truths which he has to impress on the people. I have endeavoured, in charging my deacons, to impress upon them that their immediate duty is to teach children their Catechism,

in which, under the direction of the parochial incumbents, they are to do all they can, and to make it their earnest occupation, particularly during their diaconate, to learn the best way of executing that important office of the ministry to which they have been introduced. I venture to entreat you all to assist me in this vast object. If I use strong words on this matter, they are not words stronger than have been already used by men infinitely superior to myself; and I should like to be enabled to quote one or two passages I have met with on the subject of catechising. Bishop Burnet, for example, says of the Church Catechism:—"It is to be considered as the most solemn declaration of the sense of the Church, since that is the doctrine in which we instruct all her children." There is undeniable truth in that, and I think the undeniable inference from that truth is, that it is our special duty to learn to catechise well, if we can. I will go now from Burnet to Stillingfleet. I recollect the purport of a passage from Stillingfleet, in which he shows that catechising must be peculiarly considered as the glory of the Reformation. Before the Reformation there was hardly any catechising at all. He does not mean to say there was literally none, but that there was only very little. One of the glories of the Reformation, then, was the introduction of the practice of catechising, and since then, he says, we know well that the Church of Rome has followed up the example. I must say she has produced for her own system a very admirable work, the *Catechismus ad Parochos*. I wish that we had an equally good work to instruct our Clergy in the art of teaching; but I believe that the Church of Rome is indebted to the Reformation for inducing them to produce such a work. I need not state what great divines among us have given all their energies, all their learning, and all their powers, to teach well the Catechism. When I recollect what Hammond, Nicholson, and others have done, I say that we are rich in such examples. I may also mention the works of another divine, who yields to no man that the English Church has ever produced in piety and in goodness, and to not many in intellect; and I cite him as one of the most valuable examples that a parochial clergyman can have, and as one of the highest authorities on this question—I refer to Bishop Ken. There was also Bishop Wilson, and I will conclude what I have to say on this subject with a passage from Bishop Wilson. Bishop Wilson, I remember, had an application made to allow a sermon to be introduced at evening prayer instead of the Catechism; you will find it mentioned in his Charges, at page 192; he declined, because it would in a great measure set aside what he called the express duty of catechising, to which he says the Clergy are bound by the laws, rubrics, and canons of the Church, and which, if it be performed as it should be, with seriousness and painstaking in explaining the several parts of the Catechism, would be of more use to the souls both of the learned and of the ignorant than the very best sermon that was ever heard from the pulpit. I avow that my entire assent goes with that observation of Bishop Wilson. He goes on in a following Charge, delivered in 1747, to say that in one of their early meetings (for they had their Diocesan Synods in

the little Diocese of Man), he had occasion to insist on the duty and “the necessity of catechising in the church during Divine service, “because it was bound upon the Clergy as strictly as laws, and canons, “and conscience, could bind it upon any minister of God. This is “a truth, my reverend brethren, not to be questioned, and the plainest “sermon out of the pulpit will not be understood, or be profitable in “any way so much as if the minds of the people had been well grounded “in the principles of Christianity contained in our Church Catechism ; “so that, spiritually, our preaching is in vain to all such, which I fear “is the case in a great part of the country.” I will not trouble you further, except to make this practical remark, which is present, however, to the minds of all of us, that where the thing is well done, not where it is carelessly or cursorily done, but where preparation is made for the work, where too much is not done at once, where the minister himself first resolves fully to understand every clause and every sentence in the Catechism so as to question intelligently, and to have the answers given as they should be given, there is no one thing more instructive to the people, or more satisfactory to the minister. It is a great delight, I venture to affirm from my own experience, to parents, to hear the clergyman ask their children questions, and to have specimens of their knowledge and their acuteness exhibited before their neighbours. I believe, therefore, that a more effectual engine in the hands of a Clergyman for exciting a greater regard for the high truths of Christianity in all his people, particularly in the hands of the rustic clergy, could not be adopted, than by carrying out, as far as possible, the practice of catechising.

The Rev. JOHN CARSLAKE DUNCAN YULE.—I will venture, my Lord, to trouble the Synod with only a very few observations. It so happens that I was ordained by the late Bishop Carey—

The LORD BISHOP.—I highly honour the memory of the late Bishop Carey, and I never hear him mentioned but with great respect.

The Rev. JOHN CARSLAKE DUNCAN YULE.—I was ordained by the late Bishop Carey, my Lord, to a Lectureship in the extreme east of this county, founded by a distinguished family for the purpose of catechising the children of the people, and delivering a lecture there either at, or after the Evening Service. The Lectureship was founded expressly for that purpose, and I held it for nearly two years ; and from my own experience I can assure your Lordship that never, during any two years of my life, did I see so much benefit arise, especially to the lower classes of my people, as from that catechising and that lecture. I was succeeded in the Lectureship by Bishop Medley ; he held it for a year, when he was called away to a different sphere ; but I have also his testimony in favour of the great benefit of catechising to the people in public during service.

The Rev. PHILIP CARLYON.—It fell to my lot, my Lord, to suggest, in the Deanery of Christianity, the consideration of this important question. I did not, however, anticipate, at the time, and I regret that in consequence of its having originated with me, it has fallen into my feeble hands, to move a Resolution on the subject. I am myself so

deeply impressed with the importance and the practical influence of catechising on the best spiritual interests of our flocks, that I wish to obtain your Lordship's sanction and encouragement to the carrying it out to a further limited extent. I am very thankful to your Lordship for having introduced this subject with the remarks which you have addressed to the Synod. They have relieved my mind much, for I feared that the consideration of the subject might bring on a discussion. I do not so much dwell on the binding character of the law of the Church, although it will be a great relief to my conscience to be able to carry it out further than I have done, as I rest it on the spiritual importance of the practice of catechising, especially to our poor people. Your Lordship has given us your own opinion, and the opinions of several wise and learned bishops who have advocated the duty of catechising. I can only say that my own personal experience in a large parish completely bears out the testimony which those opinions have given. We must be aware that extreme ignorance prevails among our poor people upon the very first principles of our faith. We preach over and over again, not only on the great questions which have been settled in the Synod this day, but even upon the fundamental points of the Christian faith; we preach, I say, on these over and over again to our people, yet we find, upon going to their cottages, that our preaching has left little or no impression on their hearts. There is, perhaps, in the English mind a deficiency in the reflective or reasoning powers, particularly among the poor, which creates deadness, or dulness, to the effect of a public discourse from the pulpit; but the practice of catechising draws these powers out; it leads the people to reflect and to reason, and to apply to their own cases those great points of Christian faith, and doctrine, and practice, which we wish especially to bring before them. It is upon this ground, and upon the ground of the spiritual practical importance of catechising upon the minds and hearts of our people, that I am anxious to obtain your Lordship's sanction and encouragement to begin the work anew in my own parish. Upon the one hand, I should do so with the utmost caution; but upon the other hand, I feel there are difficulties and obstacles in the way; I feel there are great personal qualifications indeed required; that there is a great coolness and collection of thought and a logical precision of mind which we must all study to acquire before we can stand before our congregations to catechise; because we wish, while teaching the children in public, to reach the hearts of their parents. I think that in some measure the universal establishment of Sunday-schools seems to have superseded a positive compliance with the law in this respect. [A MEMBER—"No, no."] I say, to some extent; at all events it is a consideration which should weigh on the other side of the balance, but most of all it is a consideration which may possibly create a certain amount of distaste to catechising in public on the minds of our people. In some places it may not at first be a popular subject to be brought before our flocks; but I think it will be our own fault, or it may be our own infirmity, if catechising should continue to be distasteful or unpopular in the hearts and minds of our people. We must prepare for it, there-

fore, with deep, earnest, sincere, and fervent prayer for God's blessing ; and if we do set to work with due qualification ourselves, I look for the greatest possible practical blessings to rest upon our people and upon the Church at large by the re-introduction of the practice. Upon the one side there are encouragements, and upon the other difficulties ; and therefore I have endeavoured to shape the Resolution so that we may have by it his Lordship's sanction and encouragement for it, but at the same time so as not to enforce the practice as a positive duty to be made binding upon all, for this reason especially, that one rule cannot apply to all our distinct and separate parishes. I should be very sorry to be bound by any positive and stringent order myself, but I certainly should be glad to have his Lordship's sanction and encouragement given to me in beginning to make the attempt at least in one afternoon in every month of the year. I therefore beg to move the following Resolution :—

8. "Whereas the duty of catechising upon Sundays and holidays, after the Second Lesson at Evening Prayer, is enjoined by the law of the Church and realm ; and whereas, in our opinion, the neglect of this duty has allowed ignorance and error on the first principles of our faith to grow and prevail ; it seems to the Synod that the practice of catechising is 'binding upon the curate of every parish,' and should be carried out so far at least as each in his discretion shall judge to be most edifying to the congregation wherein he ministers."

The Rev. WILLIAM KARSLAKE.—I beg to second the Resolution. My own ministry in the Church has now extended to a period of more than fifty years, and I can truly say that during thirty-four years of that time there was no dissent in my parish, in which parish I beg to say I am still officiating. But about that time a Sunday-school was established, and on this I withdrew from the practice of catechising in my church during Service, as the people thought it would be sufficient to have it in the Sunday-school. But from that time dissent has certainly grown up in the parish, till it has now arrived at a considerable amount ; and I certainly attribute it to the fact of having relinquished public catechising in the church. I recollect now, with very great pleasure, the gratification with which the parents listened to their children, and masters and mistresses to their apprentices (for apprentices were placed in farm-houses in those days), whilst they gave their answers to the minister, and observed the improvement which they made ; and I verily believe, though I never was competent to catechise or to use the language which many other ministers can, that the practice has a very powerful effect in keeping a knowledge of the faith of the Church in the recollection of the grown people, and that they were thereby made more hearty in the cause of the Church than many of them are, unfortunately, now.

The Venerable Archdeacon MOORE STEVENS.—Speaking from my experience, my Lord, as the minister of a country parish, I can testify to the great advantage of catechising in public. I have never discontinued it. I cannot say, however, whether it is the case in Exeter or not, but I have always done it myself, and I must say it has always

excited an interest in the parents, who are naturally interested in the acquirements of their children, and in their answering well and properly.

The Rev. CHRISTOPHER CHURCHILL BARTHOLOMEW.—I beg to express my cordial concurrence with the Resolution. In the preliminary discussion on this subject, which took place among the clergy of the Deanery of Christianity, I was anxious that a Resolution too stringent should not be passed, bearing in mind as I did the different circumstances in which different country parishes are placed. For instance, in this city of Exeter, my friend Mr. Carlyon and myself are placed in very different circumstances. He has the happiness of having a parochial school, which I have not, and that would make a considerable difference in our being able to carry out the Resolution. The time, I hope, is not far distant when I may have the advantage of a parochial school in my parish of St. David's; but I did feel, and I feel now, it would be very dangerous and very difficult to attempt to carry out a stringent Resolution, calling upon all the clergy, universally and without exception, to begin the work of catechists. At the same time I feel the deep importance of the subject; and I have no doubt that by God's blessing it will be found that where it is carried on cautiously, where we do not set ourselves too directly against existing feelings and prejudices, where we have the proper materials, and above all, where the clergyman shall have acquired something of that degree of preparation, both of the heart and the intellect involved in the art of instructing well in public, involving also a combination of the highest order of qualities, the practice will be eminently beneficial and successful. Under these circumstances I conceive that a steady and consistent determination upon the part of the clergy to revive the system of catechetical instruction, and thereby to convey to the minds of the poorer classes a connected, systematic and perfect knowledge of our faith, will under God's blessing be the most effective instrument of reviving that faith over England, which unhappily is now in so much danger from so many, and from such opposing quarters.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—I wish to ask the opinion of your Lordship, whether the exercise of catechising should be taken as absolutely to supersede the afternoon sermon, or whether it would be additional, according as the parochial ministers might find it expedient?

The LORD BISHOP.—There is nothing in the Resolution upon the subject of an afternoon sermon.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—But, with submission to your Lordship, my question was, whether catechising would supersede the sermon?

The LORD BISHOP.—That is a question which I think might be left to the discretion of the minister himself.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—There is another question: Whether we should be confined in this matter to the directions of the Rubric, or have the further latitude which is given to us by the Canon?

The LORD BISHOP.—We cannot decide against the Rubric. That is clear. And it would be unseemly to come to a Resolution that would seem to be casting a censure upon that which is our law. The Rubric

is both a Canon and a Statute. We cannot doubt, therefore, which is binding; and if they differ, there can be no doubt that the Rubric supersedes the Canon. The Rubric is the Canon of 1661, which of course supersedes the Canon of 1603; besides, it comes to us strengthened by all the authority that has been subsequently given to it. We cannot therefore hesitate as to its binding character. The Rubric is our law; and where there is a Rubric we are not at liberty to go to an earlier Canon, unless to explain what may be doubtful in the Rubric. I do not say I should in all cases blame the exercise of discretion on the part of my clergy who think that, without offending against the Canon, it may be more useful to catechise before church, or instead of a sermon; but I think we had better avoid stating upon what grounds their discretion is to be exercised. I wish to avoid prescribing any exact line. I only wish to impress upon my clergy strongly, because of its importance, the great duty of catechising to a very efficient extent. As to the exact way, the times, and the mode in which it is to be done, I would rather be spared the expression of an opinion.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—I am most glad to hear your Lordship's observations, and I shall thoroughly support the Resolution.

The Rev. Prebendary LUNEX.—I cannot admit that the existence of Sunday-schools, and the practice of catechising the children of the poor in them, superseded in any degree the importance and necessity of public catechising, in the time of Divine service. So far from it, I believe that many, if not most, of the evils with which the Church is at this time afflicted, may be traced to the very general neglect of this usage; and, that the necessity for calling together the very assembly which I now have the honour of addressing arose, mainly, from there being, for so many years, an uncatechised Church. It is to this neglect that I attribute the lamentable ignorance of so many, even of the educated classes, of the distinctive principles of the Church of their baptism, and the very general impatience which they have recently exhibited to a more distinctive teaching. The concluding remarks of my friend, Prebendary Hole, in the eloquent and forcible speech to which we have just listened, contains an illustration in point. He has adverted to the fact, that many persons are opposed to the Church's doctrine of regeneration, from confounding it, in their minds, with conversion. Now would they, I would ask, be unable to perceive the distinction between regenerating and converting grace, if the practice of catechising in the congregation had not been discontinued? For myself, I most fully concur in the sentiment expressed in the paragraph which his Lordship has read to us, from the charge of Bishop Wilson; that "catechising, if performed with seriousness and ability, would be of more use to the souls of the learned "as well as the ignorant, than the best sermon ever preached from the "pulpit." It is altogether a mistake, to suppose that the catechising of the young must, of necessity, be either uninteresting or unedifying to the more advanced in life. Far otherwise, we have had evidence, of late years, of the contrary, in our own church. I should be very

sorry to advert needlessly to any topic which would be likely to excite one discordant note in our, hitherto, harmonious discussions; and I will, therefore, in the reference I am about to make, strictly confine myself to the one subject before them. I cannot, however, while speaking on this subject, forget the very great and general interest which has been excited by the public catechising of an able and zealous clergyman, lately labouring in a populous and important parish in the vicinity of London, whose labours, though now suspended, will ere long, I trust, be resumed within the church in which he has been so zealous and so distinguished a minister. I have myself had the benefit of being present, on more than one occasion, when the clergyman I refer to was catechising, as was his custom, during the Afternoon Service. I have seen there, on those occasions, the great, the learned, the noble, the Clergy of all degrees, including their Bishops—all, apparently, as much, or more interested, and I doubt not, as much edified, as they would have been by the most able and eloquent sermon. (The speaker was understood to refer to Mr. Bennett.) Why do I advert to this circumstance? Simply to prove, that public catechising *may* be made as instructive, and as useful, to the aged as to the young, to the learned as to the unlettered; and that one great benefit which would be likely to result from a more general return to this use and order of the Church, would be the edifying of *all* the members of our several congregations, of building them up in their most holy faith, and of enabling them to stand fast, from whatever quarter, and by whatever wind of doctrine, their faith might be assailed. I would merely add, that my main purpose, in resuming this too long neglected usage, would be not so much the teaching or training the lambs of my flock, as it would be my endeavour, through the understandings of the children, to reach to the heads, as well as the hearts, of their parents. In conclusion, therefore, I would venture to express a hope, that some Resolution will be unanimously passed by us, which may have the effect of inducing ourselves, and others, to resume the practice of catechising, during the Afternoon Service, wherever it has been abandoned, and can, without prejudice, be again adopted.

The LORD BISHOP.—It will, I am sure, be satisfactory to Mr. Luney, when I tell him that Mr. Carlyon has left out of the Resolution the passage relative to catechising in Sunday-schools.

The Rev. WILLIAM BURROUGH COSENS.—I wish to say a few words upon the subject of catechising, because it is a practice I adopted now nearly twenty years since in a country parish. I am able to confirm the testimony which your Lordship has read from Bishop Wilson. I adopted the practice, not instead of an afternoon sermon, but in addition to it; and I had repeated thanks offered to me from the elder members of my parish, accompanied with this extraordinary expression—"Sir, we have learned something by it." They used to listen with the greatest eagerness to the catechising of the children, from many of whom, I was given to understand, they derived some advantage in the way of instruction.

The Rev. ROBERT HENRY FORTESCUE.—I wish to ask one question in reference to a few words that fell from your Lordship when speaking of catechising. Your Lordship was speaking in praise of the benefits derived from catechising in the church, and you added the words, “during Divine service.” This appears to me to be carrying out the Canon; but I wish to ask whether it would be unlawful for a clergyman who thought it not right, for sufficient reasons, to catechise after the Second Lesson, to catechise a certain time before service instead of in the Sunday-school?

The LORD BISHOP.—In answer to that question, I apprehend it would be no infringement of the law to catechise in the church before Divine service. The infringement of the law would be in not catechising in church during Divine service; but upon this subject I wish my general observations concerning discretion should apply. Of course those observations must apply to that, because it was apparent that Bishop Wilson was contemplating the great benefit of catechising in church, for he is speaking of the benefit derived to the congregation there assembled.

The Rev. WILLIAM KARSLAKE.—I have a perfect recollection for nearly sixty years, that it used to be the practice to catechise after the Second Lesson.

The Rev. JOHN ROUGHTON HOGG, of Brixham.—It is my lot to labour among a very peculiar class of people, a class among whom I am enabled to catechise apprentices and their masters too. They are fishermen. They spend their Sundays ashore, and I catechise thirty or forty adults and young boys together. Until the last two years my instructions, which are given in a room, were not catechetical but dogmatic, and I found that the parties learned nothing. I therefore adopted the catechetical mode. I question the old men as well as the boys, and I was enabled last year to present to your Lordship several adults for Confirmation, who, from being sailors, had received no instruction before. I have the satisfaction to say that I now find those who attend my catechetical instructions retain thoroughly what they have learned, and I hope they are becoming patterns to others in the parish.

The Resolution was carried unanimously.

The Rev. THOMAS HOPKINS BRITTON.—I would venture to propose to your Lordship, that in reviving the practice of catechising in our churches, the course should be adopted which is laid down in the *Reformatio Legum*. It is there laid down that in all country parishes upon Saints' days, after morning service, there should be a homily; but in the afternoon the curate shall deliver instruction to the children in the Catechism, and, after this, the parochial minister shall deliver a sermon explanatory of some portion of the Catechism. Bishop Nicholson says, that sermons on desultory texts, without the Catechism, will be of little use; and he desires his Clergy to convert their afternoon lectures into explanations of some of the necessary rudiments of the Catechism. Archbishop Tenison prudently reconciled catechising with the manners and humours of the times by directing his suffra-

gans to recommend it to their Clergy, since they must preach, to preach (after having examined the children in their Catechism by the rubrical inquiries) in the afternoon upon catechetical heads, both that the people might be better rooted and grounded in the faith, and also kept from other assemblies. I would therefore suggest that in endeavouring to revive public catechism in church we should adopt the plan of the *Reformatio Legum*, at such period as the clergyman may think fit, and that lectures be then delivered upon some part of the Catechism.

The LORD BISHOP.—I do not mean to prevent this being a Resolution of the Synod if it is thought desirable, especially because I think it is useful that these things should be thrown out for discussion. But the Synod, synodically adopting any special mode, would, in my opinion, be less desirable than leaving the matter to the discretion of each congregation.

The Rev. JOHN DOWNALL.—Such a proposal would interfere with the discretionary part of the previous Resolution, which is, I think, one of its highest recommendations. After what has been stated, I for one should prefer to rely upon the discretion of each clergyman, who will conscientiously act according to the circumstances in which he is placed.

The Rev. THOMAS HOPKINS BRITTON.—After such an expression of opinion, I shall not, my Lord, press the proposal.

The Rev. WILLIAM TUCKER ARUNDELL RADFORD.—An afternoon sermon having been ordered by your Lordship, may I mention that I do not think it would be desirable that we should adopt the system of catechising once a month, or once a fortnight, but that it should be at certain periods of the year continuously?

The LORD BISHOP.—I am thankful to Mr. Radford for having called attention to this point. I was not aware of the mischief I might be doing when I ordered an evening sermon; but I am not aware that I ordered it generally. Whenever it has been so ordered by me, it has been merely to take care that more than mere prayers should be observed. Having said that, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying, that I wish any gentleman here who has received that order will consider it as withdrawn immediately, upon his stating that in his discretion it will interfere with catechising, which I think incomparably more useful, and more improving to yourselves,—for that is a very important point. Do not, however, let it be supposed that I do not take the necessity for improvement to myself also.

The Rev. WILLIAM TUCKER ARUNDELL RADFORD.—May I venture to ask a question from your Lordship's superior judgment? I have always had a short lecture upon the subjects in the Catechism; but it is, in my mind, a matter of great doubt whether that address ought to come in place of the sermon, or immediately after the catechising.

The LORD BISHOP.—The catechising, when in church, ought to be in the place pointed out by the rubric; but I think it may be quite open to make your address as a sermon afterwards, taking part of the Catechism as the subject, particularly that upon which you have been catechising the young people.

The Rev. WILLIAM TUCKER ARUNDELL RADFORD.—The only difficulty I felt, my Lord, was as to the time.

The LORD BISHOP.—Just so. The words in the rubric are that you shall “instruct” in the Catechism. I never would enforce a sermon, where I found that there was an efficient catechising going on.

The Rev. Dr. COLERIDGE.—My reverend brethren and your Lordship will, I am sure, permit me to say that great advantage will be found in the practice of continuous catechising at stated periods. In my early years I was curate to a canon of this cathedral. It was his custom for a great number of years, always in the six Sundays during Lent to catechise the children, and to give a catechetical lecture the following day ; and the greatest advantage was derived to the children of the parish from that practice. I followed his example in the parish to which I afterwards went, and I believe that much benefit was derived from the practice being kept up, upon several Sundays together, at stated times of the year. The knowledge that it was to take place during the six Sundays in Lent, brought the congregation together, and I had reason to believe that the result was most beneficial to the people. The whole of the year, of course, is not occupied by this ; but I think, my Lord, that by having the subject brought before our people for two months continuously, there would be time to go through the Catechism as a whole, and to connect its several parts together, so that it would be more likely to sink into the memories of the children, and to make an impression upon their practice, than if you took it once a Sunday only, at intervals of two or three months.

The Rev. JOHN DOWNALL.—I had myself, in the town of Liverpool, charge of a congregation with which I was for several years connected ; and there, so far from its being a doubtful experiment, even among all orders and conditions of men, I found that an Afternoon Service, when we had catechising, was attended by the most respectable, as well as the most permanent part of the congregation. The parents and friends of the children attended, not only for the protection of the children, but they came, as they themselves said, to receive more plain and simple instruction in the doctrines and principles of the Christian faith. Subsequently, I went to a parish in Kidderminster, and there, together with my colleagues, we adopted the same plan ; and, so far from the congregation being diminished by it, the attendance was always greatest when catechetical instruction was given. Since my connexion with this diocese, I have continued the practice of catechising, according to my discretion, which, I think, suits the condition and circumstances of the locality. We have, in my church, catechising after the Second Lesson the first Sunday in every month ; and, as has been also stated by Mr. Cosens, I can again give testimony to the benefit of the practice among the persons connected with us. They have always learned something. They have not verbally stated that to me, but they have borne testimony to the fact in this way—that our largest and most satisfactory congregations are the mixed congregations of all classes in the parish who assemble upon the afternoon of the first Sunday in the month, when it is my duty and privilege to give instruction, according to the best of my

ability, in the Church Catechism. It has been stated that the Catechism might be gone through in a given time. This is a matter which must be discretionary. It has sometimes taken me twelve months to go through it: sometimes it has taken me twelve Sunday afternoons to go through the Apostles' Creed, taking one article in that Creed as the subject of my catechetical instructions for each of those days.

The LORD BISHOP.—I hope I shall not be considered as invidious in saying what I am about to say. But no individual clergyman will, I am sure, consider it addressed to himself personally, for it is not intended to apply to any individual. My own experience of myself, and my own observation during the whole of my clerical life, has been, that catechising is a most difficult work, that there are very few good catechists, and that the highest and the greatest benefit to the Church would be derived from the clergy feeling it a special duty to learn the art of catechising. They would have the great satisfaction and encouragement of finding their own improvement in theological study brought out by the questions they put even to the humblest children in their parishes. I am now talking to you as I do to my deacons at their ordination; and I am confident, my reverend brethren, you will not think me at all obtruding anything authoritative in what I am now saying.

The Rev. JOHN DOWNALL.—There is one book which I may venture to recommend to the attention of those gentlemen who are beginning the practice of catechising. It is "Bather's Hints on Catechising." From that work I have derived very great advantage. There is also another book which I recommend to the notice of my brother clergymen. It is "Lectures on the Catechism," by Dr. Nixon, the present Bishop of Tasmania.

The conversation then dropped, and the Synod adjourned till the following day, after morning service.

SESSION III. Friday, June 27th.

CONTINUED PASTORAL SUPERINTENDENCE OF THE YOUNG.

THE Synod assembled again at eleven o'clock, having previously attended Morning Service in the Cathedral.

The LORD BISHOP.—The next subject, my reverend brethren, for the consideration of the Synod, is one of very great importance. It is, perhaps, one of the most important of all upon the paper, if it can be brought practically to work. It is—

"Continued Pastoral Superintendence of the young who have left school, especially the encouragement of the living together of young agricultural labourers, on a plan at once economical, and under regulations for self-discipline, in agricultural colleges;" and there is a reference to "Parochial Work," by the Rev. E. MONRO, pp. 184—198, second edition.

The Venerable Archdeacon BARTHOLOMEW.—It is with great diffi-

culty that I rise, my Lord, and my reverend brethren, to address you at this moment. I have been requested at a late period, to introduce to your notice the subject No. 3 upon the paper of matters for the consideration of the Synod; and I feel all the difficulty of approaching it before you, without having any kind of substantive proposition to make. The subject itself is one of the very deepest interest; but, as it is connected in the paper with a published work by the Rev. E. Monro, I, not having read that work, am but little fitted to address you upon it. I can only hope that those who supplied the subject for our consideration will, when it is opened out, favour us with some remarks upon the practical points which they find can be brought forward, for the conduct and management of our several parishes in this particular respect, such points being, of necessity, the most interesting to this assembly. As I said before, the subject, simply, is one of the very deepest interest to us all; and if all here feel with me upon it, it is also one connected with our bitterest recollections. It is impossible, my reverend brethren, not to have seen and felt, that the young persons in whom we have taken the greatest interest, have at a certain critical period of life, departed from having that intercourse with us as parochial ministers which they had used to have in former times, and which we must have hoped would have been continued. It is impossible for us not to have felt that there have been times when we have hoped for better things. Yet, in some way or other, it has so happened that they have slipped through our hands; and personally, I look back with the greatest possible pain to many parts of my life in which, with the very best hopes raised, I have found them very bitterly fail. There is no period in which we have found the advantage of church-working more than at the period when parties belonging to this class and condition have been preparing for the solemn rite of Confirmation. At such a period nothing perhaps can be more gratifying to us as ministers than to see the preparations made for it by our young people. I can bear witness to it myself; and it is out of this preparation that I have looked to keep up the communication which I hoped to maintain with many of those whom I loved in Christ from the very depths of my heart. And when I say that no period of their lives has given me greater hopes, it is because I have felt more than I am able to express with regard to the effect produced upon their minds at such a time, and, having reference to old feelings, with regard to what the actual state and condition of the parties was at that time compared with that in after days. Taking them all singly, as was my practice, it is impossible to express the satisfaction I felt in what passed between us; it is impossible to describe all the hopes raised in me, or the kindly feelings created in them. At such times, the heart is open, confession is made, tears are shed, obedience manifested, prayers and precepts committed to memory; and everything gives the greatest hope that we had so begun, that the work of conversion would go on happily, and be the tie between the pastor and his young people until he should go down to the grave. The effect of these feelings was that classes were immediately formed; and everything went on

well for a time. But, after a while, I found, what filled my heart with grief, that I had not the same intimate communion with them that I had before, and which I wished. It is impossible but that there must be fault somewhere. Is it the fault of the young people? Truly it must be in a great degree. I do not deny they have temptations, whilst we have not the means of rescuing them altogether; but there is a great deal, evidently, in our own system which wants correction; and I am sure that if anything can be devised by which we can have greater hold upon these young people, most earnestly will every heart rejoice if through our meeting here, hearing the remarks and explanations of all, and prayerfully considering the subject, we may be able to carry it out, not perhaps in a better spirit, for that would be impossible, but with greater hopes of success. But I ask, is the result I have alluded to, the fault of the young people alone? I should be the last person in the world to say so. It is impossible I should not feel that there is great fault in myself; and the fault which I find in myself is, that I cannot have that degree of devotedness which a man ought to have for his work. It is this devotedness, to which Mr. Monro's work will carry us. I have not read his "Parochial Work," but I have read his "Sermons," and having read them I can understand to what his success is owing. Mr. Monro's system for the pastoral superintendence of the young may be, and I am sure it is, very good; but his devotedness is the fructifying principle by which the system is to be carried out. Having, as I have just said, read his Sermons, I no longer doubt his success; and I earnestly wish I was thrown in with a person who could show me not only his advantages, but the spirit in which he gives himself to God and his people. It is his devotedness which makes me consider the spirit we all want to encourage among ourselves; and it will be, I hope, one of the blessed effects of this Synod that we shall depart to our homes with a consciousness of having met, according to the custom of the Church, in the spirit in which we are assembled, with more devotedness than when perhaps we entered upon our deliberations. There is that feeling in my own mind, and everything I see around me indicates the same convictions. But let me my Lord, just make one additional remark. When I look around me, I see here in this Synod all kinds and shades of opinion. How could I hope, in the first instance, that anything could have carried all those different kinds and shades of opinion into one harmonious concord and agreement, such as was the case yesterday? What is it that is in this place now—what is it that has given us that cordial unity which has been manifested among us? It is my firm belief, it is the Spirit of God that is among us. Therefore, humanly speaking, while I say, "How could I hope to see what I have seen within the last three days?" I say again, "Why had I so little faith as not to believe that when, in accordance with the usage of the Church, we came with prayer and a humble determination to serve God; when we came from the Holy Communion, the Bishop presiding, to this place, where we are all willing to obey him as our Father in God in all things right

and proper—I say, under such circumstances, we have no right but to believe that the harmonious agreement, which we did not foresee, but to which we have come, has been brought to pass by the blessing of the Spirit of God.” I hope you will not think I say one word which I do not feel from my very heart, when I say that I think we shall find that the Spirit of God is with us. I think that the very devotedness of which I have spoken is one of the things we shall have the happiness to find increased among us in the course of this Synod. I trust none of us will depart hence exactly as he entered in this respect; but with the feeling that he goes forth, in the power of God, with renewed spirit to do the work which God has been pleased to assign to his charge. Though there are many here who under such feelings have really, honestly, earnestly devoted themselves to the service of God and his people, there are none of us who will not see that there is something more which they could do, more than they have done, and which God’s Spirit alone can give them the power to do. I therefore conclude with commending this important subject to your notice, in the belief that the opening out of this question will give opportunity for its being shown how a good and right system may be carried to perfection by the devotedness of the person who enters into it. It is in that hope I sit down, trusting that those who follow me will be enabled to show you the manner in which this great and good work is to be done.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—Before I enter upon the particular subject which I have to bring under the notice of the Synod, I cannot help, in a few words, expressing my hearty and entire agreement with what the Venerable Archdeacon has just said; words which, coming as they did from his own heart, have penetrated into every one of ours. I will venture to say of myself, that having been now for eighteen years working, I hope not altogether without some effect—in the Lord’s vineyard, I can most truly say that I never had my shortcomings, and my ignorance—my positive ignorance—brought more plainly and clearly home to my understanding and feelings than I have within the last two days. I will not say one word more upon that point; but I think there are few here who will not sympathise with me in that respect. In one respect only have I the advantage over my venerable and reverend friend. It is in this, that I have read the work of Mr. Monro. At the same time, I cannot say I have read it so perfectly as to have mastered its contents; but have read sufficient of it—and especially that part which refers to the present subject, from pp. 184 to 198—to be enabled to say, that with the general outline and spirit of Mr. Monro’s scheme I cannot but express my hearty concurrence. The general outline, in fact, is indicated in the subject as it is set before us. Mr. Monro says, that in an ordinary way, in our parishes, as soon as the children have left the school, which may be at fourteen years of age—and in most country parishes it is at ten, or probably from that to twelve—we have absolutely no practical hold upon them whatever, according to the ordinary

organization of our parochial work, until the time comes when we have the Confirmation approaching. It has been said, and I am aware it is the wish of the Bishop, and certainly it is a most just and wise wish, that we should not confine our preparation of candidates to a few weeks before confirmation, but that we should always have it in our eye, and, as far as possible, in our practice. But I am afraid that, in point of fact, we have in our several parishes found it a simple impossibility, with our present arrangements, to do anything more in that respect than, by dint of hard work, and personal persuasion of the masters and mistresses, to wring from them, generally, the unwilling concession that their apprentices, servants, or dependents should come and give us a few hours for a few weeks before the actual confirmation. But as to asking them to allow their apprentices to come even once a week, to spend one hour with us for pastoral instruction and guidance—that is a thing which, in point of fact, has not been realized in any parish in this Diocese. I think, too, unless we adopt some more efficient plan than has hitherto been adopted for the purpose, it would be simply impossible to bring the matter about. We know this to be the case in large towns as well as in country parishes. One of my reverend friends has attributed to me the care of a country parish, but it so happens that my parish combines a town as well as a rural district. It is not a large town, but still it is a town with 1,400 or 1,500 inhabitants congregated together, and a country population of some 400 or 500, who are very much scattered. I have, therefore, some experience of a double difficulty. I can state, as a matter of experience, that a large number of young men from the age of fourteen until they are married, are at this moment, and have been for some years, and especially since the giving up of the system of apprenticeship, which has been practically a great moral evil,—these young men have been living constantly at night in the houses of their parents, often with very young children, often with grown-up daughters, having one single bedroom, usually with five, six, seven, eight, nine, and in some instances I have known even with twelve members of the family crowded together. They have thus been living with every temptation to immorality, with every possible inducement to destroy any fine delicacy of feeling, or any religious impressions; and they have thus been spending their evenings and nights, being all day long at work, earning by the sweat of their brow, according to God's ordinance, their daily bread. The only exchange for these unhappy persons is, from hard bodily labour to an atmosphere of moral defilement for their minds. It may be said that it is visionary to attempt to find a remedy for this evil—that we cannot hope to alter human nature—that we cannot make the poor rich. We cannot, I admit, do these things; but it has been found in other places that, paying due consideration to human nature, and to the poverty of those who cannot help themselves, institutions may be provided, which will diminish the extent of such evils. Much as we may fear the very name in this country of anything like monastic institutions—but I will not use the word—

much as we may fear anything like collegiate bodies with any semblance of religion attached to them, yet I must express my belief that morally and religiously we shall never meet the accumulated evils of our country and town parishes, unless we provide for our young persons some safe place of refuge, where they may be brought together, at least a great many of them, according to some safe rules, having a sufficient latitude of liberty to make them feel at their ease, but a sufficient amount of restriction to make them ashamed of doing what is very wrong. Such institutions would be of enormous benefit to our country and to our Church. It is such an institution of which Mr. Monro speaks, but not theoretically. There is no statement in all his "Parochial Work" more practically wise than this—and I believe he always speaks from experience—that Englishmen do not want to be theorized with, but that they want to have facts placed before them; and, when they see things in operation, then they understand whether they are good. Is not this assembly an instance of that? I apprehend no such powerful argument for it could be devised by the wisest heads, though it were expressed in the clearest terms, and published in many books, than the simple fact of our having met, and done some work well. But I return to the subject. Mr. Monro has actually instituted such a college in his own parish, and he has found it to work well. I will just refer to one other authority, which will show that Mr. Monro has done some good; that though men may laugh at him (and many have), and though they may despise him, yet that practically his example has had very great influence already. We are not likely to find an instance that will show it has had weight more strong than this—that his Royal Highness Prince Albert has cordially adopted the proposition. It has been brought before the Prince in a work which I have in my hands, published at the Prince's express desire, written too and approved, every word, by him before it was published, and at this moment being largely carried out in Windsor and the neighbourhood. In this book we find this suggestion, speaking of the report of an Inspector:—

"Under these circumstances much good would be done if, besides "providing suitable lodgings for young men, accommodation for sleeping were provided also for lads still of an age to go to school."

This is from a pamphlet by the Rev. T. T. Carter, Rector of Clewer, called, "Some Remarks upon the Physical and Social Condition of the "Labouring Classes at Windsor." It is published under the direct patronage of Her Majesty, as well as of the Prince, by "J. D. Brown, "Castle-street, Windsor." The whole pamphlet is well worthy of deep consideration: and from my own knowledge of the writer, I can assure the Synod, he is a most self-denying man as a minister of God, and I know no better man in our Church as a parish priest. Indeed, I know no man who is his equal. Perhaps that alone will be sufficient justification for my having said these few words. I am not, however, prepared with a substantive Resolution, because I understood I was to appear rather as a subaltern in the matter, as the seconder of the venerable Archdeacon. Under these circumstances I did not come prepared

with a Resolution : but if I might be allowed to propose anything, it would be to this effect :—

“ That the continued pastoral superintendence of those young who “ have left school is worthy of mature consideration ; and that the “ encouragement of the living together of young agricultural labourers “ in agricultural colleges in large bodies seems most advisable to be “ adopted.”

The Rev. J. R. HOGG, Incumbent of Brixham.—I will venture to say a few words in seconding the Resolution. The peculiar difficulty in which I, as a parochial minister, am placed is this—not only have I a larger proportion of young men to deal with than the population would ordinarily supply, but they are young men who have come into the parish from all quarters of the country, chiefly because they are of high spirit, and will not bear the restrictions of home, or ordinary apprenticeship. Many of them are actually runaway apprentices from other places, and they are welcomed by the employers of Brixham because they are very daring and adventurous spirits. They are on shore every week but two days, Saturday and Sunday ; they are utterly without the influences of home ; and their masters, I am sorry to say, do not exercise that influence over them which they ought to do. The result is, that I have the greatest difficulty in collecting them together in an adult school which I have established ; but where, however, some considerable portion of them do meet for instruction. I think, my Lord, it is one of the great benefits of this Synod, that we may talk together upon these subjects of practical importance ; and I mention these circumstances in order that I may have the sympathies, and practical suggestions, of those who have brought this great subject forward. I have been this morning to visit four of these unhappy youths, whom I was compelled to send to gaol last week, though not one of them belongs to my parish. They had come into it from elsewhere, and they had shown no criminality, but they were daring to a degree. One was seized because he created a public disturbance, and the others attacked the constable who arrested the first, and they all went to gaol together. There is no real crime in the youths, but an amazing amount of audacity which we are compelled to put down by the arm of the law. Each, I trust, may be better for a little solitary confinement : but surely it is not a Clergyman’s duty, and I am sure it is not his comfort, to know that the arm of the law is to come in to assist him. I wish rather for some preventive plan, which may reach the hearts, as well as the outward lives, of these unfortunate youths, that, when I return, I may be able to say, “ Not only must you keep the law, “ but I trust you will as Christians follow me in obeying it cheerfully “ and consistently.” I trust then that some practical scheme may be devised, which may strengthen my hands in the attempt I hope to make to set up some collegiate body, if it may be so called, but as I should call it, a sailor’s home, wherein these youths may live under some wholesome discipline, and enjoy the pleasures of home while upon shore. I will only make one further remark. One of the most devoted parish ministers of the Church of England that I ever knew,

who has now unhappily gone from us though not out of this diocese, stated to me that he never found a clergyman yet who could say that the youth of his parish went on from school to confirmation, and from confirmation to communion; but that all who did come to communion were reclaimed, were in fact converts, instead of being trained up, as we profess to train them, to be the children of God brought up in the fear and love of their heavenly Father. When I recollect this, I cannot but feel that there was in this minister's mind at that time a number of causes which were leading him to stumble; and the practical result, that we never find a parish in which the children are invariably brought up as they should be, as the children of God, was, I fear, a main stumbling-block in his way. I trust therefore that we may be able to fall upon some scheme which may lead us, under the blessing of God, to remedy, at least in some degree, this great and growing evil.

The Rev. J. H. HEXT.—I beg with great respect to give the Synod some account of what has been done by a reverend friend of mine who has now left this diocese; the Rev. Mr. Golding. My friend has left this diocese now for about twelve months. He met with the same difficulty in his parochial work which we have all met with, that is, the great difficulty of retaining influence and supervision over young persons after they have left school, and between that time and the time of their marriage. He felt this difficulty more especially at the time of confirmation. He states that at one confirmation he had fifty-seven candidates, and that among these fifty-seven, in a parish of 700, only fifteen could read, and that very badly. He therefore set his energies to work to remedy such a state of things, and a more energetic man I do not know. He spoke to the largest landed proprietor in the neighbourhood (the Earl of Falmouth), who saw the thing in the same light as himself, who told him he would build a model lodging house, and give him an acre of land. Mr. Golding then went to Mr. Monro, and requested that gentleman to show him what he had done himself. I will read you a few words from what he has written upon the subject of this visit. "I have been," he says, "to Mr. Monro's parish; and I consider it a more wonderful sight than that of the "Great Exhibition, for there are very few Mr. Monros, and I am "not one of them. I spent a day with him. He has been there "fourteen years, and the bulk of the labourers in the parish have grown "up under him. The tone and aspect of the whole parish is very "different from anything I have ever seen before. The people do not "appear to labour, but all seem to be gentlemen from the effect upon "them of Christian training. The farmers reverence him. His popu- "lation is 800, and he has now under him 280 from the age of twenty- "four years down to five. It would do any man good to go there, for "what Christianity can do is there done in a way I had never before "any idea of." My friend goes on to say he is settled to build a model lodging house upon the same scale. Mr. Monro has four acres. My friend says, "I do not propose to take in lodgers under fourteen "or eighteen years old, but I shall have a few about forty to act as

“ballast to the young men.” The house he has erected is for eighteen. “The whole establishment,” it is added, “should be under the care of a sound man as superintendent and his wife as matron. I propose 30*l.* a-year for that expense, but with lodgings, coals, and candles. But these things must be regulated according to circumstances. I propose to combine adult schools with evening schools for the inmates and others. The price of the lodgings should be about one-half the earnings of the parties. Their earnings are from 7*s.* 6*d.* to 8*s.* per week; that is, they should pay about 5*s.* for lodging, washing, and the use of books. I propose to have prayers every evening. Such discipline might lead them to elect some officers from among themselves to take charge of certain things; but I am afraid in that case of their setting themselves up too much as a fraternity. These are all matters, however, which must be regulated by experience.” I think,” it is added, “the farmers will be delighted with my ideas; and that each man would willingly work one day in the week at the acre of ground.” I have not the slightest doubt, my Reverend Brethren, what will result from this. It will act in some measure as a check to improvident marriages, and also upon the causes from which those marriages generally spring, which are the illicit connexions that young people in the same parish form from having none of the comforts of home. I have great pleasure in laying the plan of Mr. Golding’s building upon the table for the inspection of my brother ministers.

In answer to a question from the Rev. Dr. HARRIS,

The Rev. J. H. HEXT added, that the cost of a building to accommodate about sixteen would be 350*l.*

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—The classes of the population who have been principally alluded to in this discussion by my reverend brethren have been agricultural chiefly; but my reverend friend and colleague Mr. Hogg has called the attention of the Synod to the circumstances of another and a peculiar class, a class of great interest, but of great difficulty in management. There is besides these another class who have some claim upon our sympathies. It is my lot, in the providence of God, to be the minister of a parish where there is a great deal of wealth upon the surface, and where everything looks to the visitor very attractive and beautiful; but where there is, underneath the surface, and behind the scenes, a degree of misery, squalor, and wretchedness which would hardly be believed by those who do not know the back settlements of our situation at Torquay. From the peculiarity of that place, where there are generally a vast number of persons of great wealth, whose charitable feelings are easily worked upon, but who do not take the trouble to inquire into the pretended cases of distress that are brought before them, there is a congregation of poor persons in the place. Many of them come in the first instance for work. They do not find it, and they fall in with other classes who have come especially for the purposes of imposition. For a time they live either by working or begging; but they soon find that honest labour is not sufficient to keep them occupied. Then they are driven

into those recesses of misery and vice, for such I must call them, where there is a great congregation of persons together of all ages and both sexes. Males and females, children and adults of all ages and degrees are congregated together in a miserable apartment, thus forming a scene of the most polluting and degrading tendency. It is impossible in such places to preserve anything like moral feeling and moral purity among either young men or young women. This is a most lamentable state of things; and my reverend brethren can testify in their several positions, that very few marriages take place among this class until they are necessitated by the very near approach of the mother's shame. Many of this class are mechanics, for such we may call them, as they are chiefly brought there in connexion with new buildings; and such are very much in want of assistance in order to keep them from the polluting influences to which I have alluded. I will here read the Resolution which was passed on this subject at the meeting of our ruri-decanal Chapter:—

“With regard to Subject 3, we feel the difficulty of maintaining “continued pastoral superintendence over the young; and approving “of the principle of establishing lodging houses for apprentices and “others in towns, and agricultural colleges in rural parishes under the “superintendence of the parochial Clergy, we would desire some “digested scheme to be recommended by the Synod.”

It is hardly to be expected, from what we have seen, that any digested scheme should be put before us; but from the remarks that have been thrown out, we, who are assembled under that gracious influence which has been so properly alluded to, shall go home to our respective work, with an earnest desire to collect together in our minds, and to compare as far as we can, the materials out of which to form a system which may be for the good of our respective parishes; and there will thus be another practical good resulting from the calling of this Synod of the Diocese of Exeter.

The Rev. J. DOWNALL.—I am going to suggest, my Lord and Reverend Brethren, that after the word “agricultural,” the words “and other labourers” should be introduced into the Resolution.

The LORD BISHOP.—In reference to what has been already observed, I would here say that it is my earnest wish that every subject should be dealt with as well as possible; and therefore, our time cannot be better employed than by following up a few things well. To do many things superficially would be useless. We cannot expect that at one Synod we should be able to go through the whole category of our parochial and ministerial necessities; let us, therefore, do what we can, but what we do, let us do as well as we can.

The Venerable Archdeacon BARTHOLOMEW.—And what remains will only make us the more anxious for another Synod.

The Rev. Prebendary SCOTT.—I do not rise to occupy the time of the Synod by any remarks as to my own experience, or to intrude my advice upon a subject of so much interest. But I venture to offer one practical suggestion towards arriving at the most fruitful mode of availing ourselves of the scattered pieces of valuable information upon

this most important question which we have just heard, and of which I trust we shall still hear more. It is manifestly impossible, that any digested scheme can be submitted to this Synod, and considered by it at this meeting ; but I think there is a plan by which we may avail ourselves of the suggestions that have been made. If your Lordship would think it right to nominate a Committee of clergy to collect this scattered information, to act as it were like a mirror in concentrating the rays of light upon the subject, and afterwards to report to your Lordship upon it, I feel persuaded that such a course would materially tend to the assistance and edification of the clergy, not only of this diocese, but of England generally.

The Rev. Prebendary LYNE.—During my long experience in the ministry, which has now extended to twenty-six years, I have given much attention to this subject. I have been engaged both in large and small parishes, in parishes comprehending persons of all trades and callings ; but I will only allude to one agricultural parish which I served in the diocese of Winchester for a period of five years. It was purely agricultural, and the population was about 800. There I gave my attention to those youths who had left the parochial school, and I opened an evening school twice a-week to meet them. I always made it a point to attend there myself; and there I prepared them for confirmation. Certain portions of the evenings were, however, devoted to obtaining secular knowledge. This school succeeded so well that at one of Bishop Tomline's visitations I presented 130 candidates for confirmation. 129 of them came to the Lord's Supper afterwards, and a great portion of them remained communicants for the four years I afterwards remained there. In the large parish to which I was lately appointed in Cornwall, which is both agricultural and mining, I have in the course of the last three weeks had an application to open an evening school. I have consented; the National schoolmaster will attend, and I also intend to be present myself. One other plan I have always adopted. I have always known the year in which confirmation would be held by the Bishop. I have always taken it for granted that his Lordship would be at his post, and I have always, three months before confirmation, called the children of the parish together. I have had, in one parish in Cornwall, as many as 230 children collected together at one time, many of them perfectly ignorant of the Catechism; but I never turned one back, because I found they were always willing to attend. And I am to say that all fell in with my plans. The most ignorant, as I have said, attended. I divided them into classes; and I found that the most ignorant would attend in order to hear the instructions given to those in the higher classes. A great many of these children are now communicants. The Venerable the Archdeacon of Barnstaple asked whose fault it was that we lost our pastoral superintendence over the young. I believe the fault is, that in large parishes we have not a sufficient number of clergy to keep up the superintendence. That is the great source of the evil ; for where there are only one or two clergymen to look after two or three thousand persons, they cannot

hope to be able to devote so much time to pastoral superintendence over youth as they could wish.

The Rev. W. B. COSENS.—I rise, my Lord, to offer a practical suggestion. I think we must have been brought to the conclusion, from all we have heard, that excellent as the plan would be for the reformation of this class, and their continuance in a life of goodness under our pastoral care, the wherewithal stands in the way. In our small parishes, I am afraid if we are to wait for the establishment of such an admirable scheme as has been set before us, we shall go down to our graves without having seen that improvement take place which it must be our hearty desire to see. I, therefore, wish now to offer what is a practical suggestion, and one which I have experienced the benefit of myself many years since. For more than thirty years I have been a parochial minister, and during the whole of that period I have had this matter at heart as far as my means would go. Now, what is the occasion and the necessity for forming a scheme for keeping these young persons under inspection and influence? What does it arise from? From a lamentable deficiency of home care. Before we can expect to see any very great improvement among the children, we must endeavour to effect some preceding improvement among their parents. But while parents are reduced to the wretched state of existence that we find them in, in many agricultural parishes, while whole families are crowded together into one small room, where all regard to morality and decency is stifled in the young, how is it possible to hope that you can keep that influence over them which will lead them to a practical life of godliness? I felt this more than twenty years ago, when I saw the miserable sight in one house of four beds in one room ten feet by twelve. The beds literally touched each other, and there were no less than twelve persons crowded in that little room. There were among them grandfather and grandmother, father and mother, and the rest of the family. The sight was too shocking to contemplate. At that time a gentleman came into the parish who purchased the manor. I went to him at once, and said, "Sir, there is an evil in our parish " which you only can remedy ; the accommodation for our labourers " is utterly insufficient, and there are evils from it of which you know " nothing ; but until you make some arrangements to let each cottage " have at least two bed-rooms, nothing can be done by the minister " of the parish towards a reformation." He instantly set to work,—and I beg you to notice what he did, because it is in the power of many to lead the squirearchy of their neighbourhoods to adopt the same plan. He instantly gave orders that the persons who had families, and who kept lodgers, should get rid of the lodgers, or to be prepared to quit their houses, as they pleased. By this means a little thinning was made. He then went to every cottage, and divided every room, except they were dilapidated, and then he pulled them down, and divided the upper part into two rooms. He also gave notice to every family, that if they took in lodgers he would turn them out of the house. The consequence was, that the accommodation which had

been so wretchedly bad before was greatly improved ; and I believe, from that moment, I was better able to see the advance of my parishioners in the decent practices of life than I ever had been before. Whilst they were living in this inhuman style, for I will not use a harsher word, from there being mixed together men, women, and children, boys and girls, all my teaching and instructions were perfectly neutralized. Now, though we can have but very little hope of returning to our parishes and there instituting a Harrow Weald for our people, we may, I think, all go boldly to our squirearchy, and tell them the need we have of their assistance. If that is done,—though, perhaps, I have less hope than some, I will not despair of seeing some improvements in the accommodations provided for the people under our care, which I believe would tend to their spiritual advantage.

The Rev. R. H. FORTESCUE.—The feeling was expressed in the deanery to which I belong, and it was shared in by many friends for whose wisdom I have the greatest reverence, that it is expedient to encourage these institutions. I feel the responsibility under which I lay, as a member of the Synod, too much to refrain from starting frivolous objections, but, on the other hand, that responsibility impels me not to be silent when I feel it a duty to speak. Every one must heartily sympathise in the touching statement of the disappointments to which we parochial ministers are subjected, made by the Venerable Arch-deacon in his opening address. There was no one here, I am sure, whose heart did not respond to, and whose experience did not confirm his statements upon that subject. But there was another statement he made which I feel was not less responded to by every minister present—and that was, that a great deal of our failure depends upon the want of devotedness in ourselves. I firmly believe that the whole mass of our failures arises from that want of devotedness which is necessary to the success of almost every scheme in the ministry not merely temporal. I think the success of Mr. Monro is to be ascribed wholly to his personal qualifications and devotedness. If we only had a Monro in every parish, no doubt the scheme proposed would succeed ; but it appears that although the scheme, under certain regulations and superintendence, would succeed, that in principle there are objections to it which ought to be taken into consideration. One great ground of the evils complained of is, upon the one hand, that parents among the poor, unhappily because they are not able, do not do their duty towards their children ; and upon the other hand, that children do not love, honour, and succour their parents. Is it the clergyman's duty under such circumstances to begin setting up lodging-houses or colleges in which refractory children are to be accommodated, or is it to endeavour to teach both parents and children to endeavour to do their duty as Christians ? The case of Mr. Hogg is almost entirely irrelevant to the greater part of our parishes. What is necessary for them, it appears, is to have lodging-houses established under the restrictions of a well-regulated home. But I believe the fact is, that in towns, and country places also, the keepers of lodging-houses are generally some of the worst people in the

place, simply because the more respectable people will not subject themselves to the inconvenience of having these young men in their houses. It seems to me, then, that in the first place there is a serious objection to this plan, inasmuch as it would occasion what I should call an unnatural and unjustifiable severance of domestic ties. What should we say of those parties who, while they kept children at school from twelve to twenty, never allowed them to have the society of their fathers and mothers? We must all feel that considerable evils would result. It appears to me, moreover, that such a combination of qualities would be required in the superintendent of these institutions as are rarely found in individuals willing to undertake the office. I would put out of the question the idea of the clergyman undertaking it, for, whatever might be a man's devotedness, he would require a number of qualifications besides that in order to undertake such a duty consistently with the proper discharge of his other pastoral duties. Mr. Monro may have great capacity for the work—he may not be liable to be injured by the restrictions which the labour of such an institution would bring him under; but if clergymen generally were to undertake it, even though they brought to it Mr. Monro's devotedness, still the minds of most of us are not so constituted; and their other parochial duties must grievously suffer by their superintendence of these lodging-houses or schools. As to the appointment of other persons, there would, as I have stated, be very great difficulty in finding those who are suitable—a circumstance which should be weighed well before any clergyman ventures upon connecting himself to such a scheme. My principal objection, however, is, that these colleges, if not so superintended, would tend only to aggravate the evils which they are designed to obviate. The words which occurred to me in the ruri-decanal Chapter were, that I feared, if they were not so superintended, they would become dens of iniquity. I believe it; and further consideration does not lead me to qualify that point. I believe they would become festering heaps of vice and profligacy. I would, therefore, express my hope, that no one should be induced to carry out such a plan without the most mature and serious consideration, and also that we should wait to see not only the success of Mr. Monro, but of the other gentleman whose name has been already mentioned, Mr. Golding. If it succeeds in two cases, I confess that will be a strong argument against me, which will tend to remove the feelings I have upon the subject. There is another difficulty in the matter to which, I am sure, my reverend friends will not be insensible—it is the fact that the wages of young boys in the country are not equal to paying the expenses of such a house. For some years after they go out, upon leaving school, they rarely get more than 6*d.* a-day, from which they go up to 8*d.* or 9*d.* Now Mr. Monro's plan, I believe, depends upon the payment, by each person, of 5*s.* 6*d.* per week at least. This objection was urged strongly by several ministers at the meeting of Clergymen, and, therefore, I believe it to be my duty to state it here. Under these circumstances, I would propose, as an Amendment,—

“That in the opinion of this Synod, the general establishment of colleges in the rural districts upon the plan suggested by Mr. Monro, is open to serious objections, inasmuch as such institutions would occasion an unjustifiable and unnatural severance of domestic ties ; secondly, that such a combination of qualities would be required in their superintendents in order to their successful conduct as would rarely be found in individuals willing to undertake the office ; and thirdly, because if not so superintended, such institutions would tend only to aggravate the evils they are designed to obviate.”

The Rev. Dr. COLERIDGE seconded the Amendment.

The Rev. Prebendary LUNNEY.—I identify myself to a great extent with the observations that have fallen from my friend and brother Mr. Fortescue, upon this important question ; but I think there are parishes so peculiarly situate that they might with great advantage, and with much facility, adopt some modifications of the plan recommended by Mr. Monro. I am confident, however, from the experience I have had in my own neighbourhood, that no modification of that plan could meet the circumstances and the necessities of our district. The lowest cost of the maintenance of the individuals in Mr. Monro's establishment very far exceeds the average wages of the labouring population in our district ; and I concur with Mr. Fortescue that there would be many serious evils arising from the interruption of the domestic ties if the system were carried to a great extent. I concur with him, too, in the opinion that very serious moral evils would result from an inadequate superintendence, if such lodging-houses are established. I also think that we should have no reasonable hope of obtaining anything like an adequate or continuous superintendence, except through the medium of the clergyman, who, if he were to devote himself to the work, must do so to the neglect, and at the expense of far more important ministerial functions. Concurring with Mr. Fortescue to this extent, I should be sorry to be a party to the Amendment to its full result, because I think if we had a Monro in every parish, I question whether even the great determination and extreme energy of Mr. Monro could establish one such institution in any of the parishes immediately adjacent to my own. But whether he could or not, I am not quite sure whether in every instance it would be desirable. Mr. Monro is peculiarly placed. He may be disposed to consecrate all his substance to the spiritual well-being of his parishioners. I should wish, therefore, my Lord, by-and-by, if the Amendment be not carried, to move another Amendment, to the effect that the suggestions thrown out by Mr. Scott, be adopted as a substantive motion, that the whole subject be referred to a Committee to be nominated by your Lordship.

The LORD BISHOP.—I am very desirous, as this is a practical point, that its merits should be known generally throughout the two counties composing this diocese. I wish to speak of the possibility of houses being provided for the poorer portions of the population at an easy rate of rent, and to show that this practically can be done. One of the most opulent and one of the most benevolent noblemen in this

country, one whose attention is constantly given to the duties of his property, —I mean the Duke of Bedford—a man of no ordinary intellect—has actually built houses of this kind. He has built a considerable number—more than a hundred altogether—at a certain rate of cost. With true wisdom he has contrived that this shall not be made a mere matter of charity; and therefore he expects a return of four per cent. upon the outlay that he has incurred in the erections. I would advise all of you who have an opportunity, to enjoy the treat of beholding the comfort of these cottages, which are occupied by labourers, and persons of that class, upon such terms as enable them to pay that, which the Duke cares not for, except as a test of the real usefulness of the measure—namely four per cent. Those which I refer to are in the immediate neighbourhood of Tavistock, and they are excellent; but besides these there are others at Milton Abbott, in the Duke's own parish.

The Rev. J. T. P. COFFIN.—I entirely agree with all that has fallen from the Venerable Archdeacon, and from Mr. Oxenham; yet there are some points in the proposal which require much more consideration than I fear we shall be able to give to them at this moment. It is for the purpose of affording opportunity for the full consideration of this subject that I beseech the Synod to adopt some measure, before coming to a conclusion either for or against the proposition, so that we may be enabled to meet a very great evil in a spirit which will not only be satisfactory to ourselves, and to those we represent, but also to the population. It has happened once in my life to have been called upon to fill situations where I have been brought into contact with a much larger population than that of my own parish. This has given me an insight into the manners and habits of the people for whose sake we are engaged in this discussion. With regard to a college for young agricultural and other labourers, it is a part only of a very great system of parochial management, which has been carried out in a most extraordinary manner by a man of a master mind. I cannot forbear stating that if I had been in possession of Mr. Monro's book when I first undertook the management of my parish, I hope I should have been a better man and a better minister than I now feel to have been. I cannot get up from the perusal of that work without feeling, in the language of our Prayer Book, that I have "left undone many things which I ought to have done, and that I have done many things which I ought not to have done." Under these circumstances I would beseech the attention of the Synod, not only to the particular point under consideration, but I would also ask them carefully to peruse the work of Mr. Monro, and to observe that it is his system not to proceed at once to these collegiate dwellings for the labouring classes, but to have them under his own management from the age of seven years till they go out to earn their bread; and that he goes on step by step, fitting them to be members of an institution where they may, if by chance immorality has been committed, become corrected. I feel quite sure, from my knowledge of that class of persons, of an age when they are likely to be brought into such an institution, that

one bad spirit among a number might perhaps not corrupt the whole, but that he might damage the whole establishment in such a way as to bring it into discredit. With regard to what has fallen from Mr. Hext, I agree that there are parishes on the sea-coast where parties resort from distant places, to occupy for a time, to earn their bread, and who are exempted, by thus leaving their homes, from parochial restraint. In a certain measure they are not under the restraint of the law, because not being resident they feel that if they do fall under the law they can leave the neighbourhood, and cannot be traced. The dwellings of the poor in these places have occupied my attention. But this is a most difficult and important subject. I can mention at this moment a case that occurred in my own parish. I gave an additional room to a poor family consisting of the wife's mother, the husband, wife, and five children. Ten days after that the parties came to me and said it would be a great help to them if I would allow them to take lodgers. This was a great discouragement to me. I mention this, however, not as a general case, but as a thing that frequently happens. I should be sorry, in conclusion, to agree to the terms of the original Resolution proposed by Mr. Prebendary Oxenham, because that, I think, would be committing the Synod; and, on the other hand, I should be equally sorry to swamp the question by consenting to the Amendment moved by Mr. Fortescue. But I shall cordially concur in any proceeding that will lead to a strict examination into the merits of the case, and if we assemble again within these walls, I shall most heartily join in any well-digested measure for effecting the object which we all have in view.

THE REV. R. H. FORTESCUE.—From the observations that have been just made, it has occurred to me, my Lord, that it would be expedient not to press my Amendment. If my reverend friend, the mover of the original Resolution, will consent to alter it so that the whole question be referred to a Committee, I shall be ready at once to withdraw the Amendment.

THE LORD BISHOP.—It appears to me that the two propositions, the original Resolution, and that for referring the subject to a Committee, are most consistent with each other. I must say this, and I say it unfeignedly, that I am perhaps one of the least qualified persons in this assembly to come to a definite opinion upon the case; but at the same time it appears to me that the real question we shall have to consider is this—Shall we have a Committee with a resolution going to them that will recommend this as a measure that we shall be glad to find practicable, or with a declaration that we think it hopeless to attempt it? I apprehend that the latter, however the terms of the amendment might have justified it, is now withdrawn, and that that view is no longer taken. It is, then, no longer desirable to send this subject to a Committee with a halter round its neck. The feeling would rather seem to be that there should be a Committee to consider thoroughly the reasons aye and no; and we have seen so much of sound reason and principle exhibited in the discussion, that if those gentlemen who have joined in it were to meet as a Committee and report, it

appears to me that we might come to a greatly-good practical conclusion. If the words of the Resolution are such as to decide the question aye or no at once, that is a different matter. I think we ought rather to have it left an open question.

After a brief consultation it was agreed that both the original Resolution and the Amendment should be withdrawn in favour of a general reference to a Committee.

In the meantime,

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM said—I beg your Lordship's permission to address a few words to the Synod in answer to the objections which have been urged by some of my reverend brethren to the establishment of such institutions as have been in our contemplation. Three main objections have been alleged, each of which can, I think, be readily answered. The first is, that they would promote a severance of the domestic ties. I apprehend that no such severance of ties is contemplated at all. Those who will be put into these Colleges, or Homes, or whatever else they may be called, in any parish, would be within a few yards of their own parents' doors; and probably they would be able to have fully as much intercourse with them, at all proper times, as they have now. Their separation would be simply during the hours of sleep, and then they would have decent instead of indecent places for their rest. The next argument, in the nature of an objection, was, that we should not be able, generally, to find persons fit to undertake the office of Superintendent, and that from the duties of the Clergy at present, they would be wholly unable to meet the requirements of the case. In reply to this, I beg to say that I esteem this proposition to be only part of a larger plan; that the only effectual way of meeting the wants of our parishes is to have other schemes besides this, and that the scheme I shall submit when the next subject comes under consideration, for increasing the number of authorized teachers and assistants of ministers, will go far towards removing the objection altogether. The third objection is, that if these institutions be under no regulation, or under bad regulation, they would become dens of iniquity. I admit it. But the scheme is, that they shall be under good, sound, wholesome regulation; and that I think we shall secure.

The original Resolution and the Amendment having been formally withdrawn,

The Rev. Prebendary SCOTT moved,—

9. "That the continued pastoral superintendence of the young who have left school is a subject deserving the most mature consideration; and that the whole matter be referred to a Committee to be forthwith nominated by the Lord Bishop, and to report to his Lordship: and that the Committee be requested to confer with the Diocesan and Local Boards on the subject."

The Rev. Chancellor HARRINGTON seconded the Resolution.

The Resolution was carried unanimously.

The LORD BISHOP then nominated the following members of the Synod to be the Committee:—

The Ven. Archdeacon Moore Stevens.
 The Ven. Archdeacon Bartholomew.
 The Rev. Chancellor Harington.
 The Rev. Prebendary Oxenham.
 The Rev. Prebendary Woolcombe.
 The Rev. Prebendary Scott.
 The Rev. Prebendary Lyne
 The Rev. Prebendary Luney.

The Rev. Dr. Harris.
 The Rev. Dr. Coleridge.
 The Rev. Robert Fortescue.
 The Rev. William Burrough Cosens.
 The Rev. John Roughton Hogg.
 The Rev. John Hawkins Hext.
 The Rev. John Downall.
 The Rev. John Thomas Pine Coffin.

ORDAINING OF PERMANENT DEACONS.

THE LORD BISHOP.—The next subject for the consideration of the Synod is that of “increasing the number of authorized Teachers and “Assistants of Ministers by the ordaining of Permanent Deacons, especially of Teachers duly recommended from the Training College at “Exeter.” In order to make this question understood, so that the Synod may know what is open to them to do upon this question, I shall make some explanations. The word “permanent” is not to be considered in the same sense as “perpetual.” It is only to be understood as “long-enduring,” for a higher authority than ours has decided that Deacons are not to be excluded from the higher order of the ministry. I may therefore state the sense in which I understand the word “permanent,” by telling you what I have done, and what I mean to continue to do. I have accepted and licensed, and I shall continue to accept, as a title to Holy Orders, the nomination of a non-academic person to be the Deacon of the Minister who nominates him, not in the ordinary form, as his Assistant. Of course such Deacon will be his assistant ; but I feel it right that there should be a broad distinction drawn between the class of persons to whom we are looking here, and those who are academics. It must be understood that such Deacons are not to claim to be admitted to the priesthood until they have acquired an academic degree, which the ordinary rule of the Diocese demands. Yet, mindful of the apostolic rule, that those who use the office of a Deacon well, purchase to themselves a good degree ; and mindful also of the prayers that our Church makes over them at their ordination, namely, that they may deserve to be admitted to the higher ministries of the Church, I cannot consider the priesthood as not open also to such persons as shall by great merit prove themselves, after long probation, worthy to be admitted to that higher order.

THE REV. PREBENDARY OXENHAM.—I shall proceed at once to the subject, and without any preface I will read the Resolution I have to submit to the consideration of the Synod :—

10. “That the Synod believes that the restoration of a permanent, or “comparatively permanent, order of Deacons under proper restrictions “would be highly advantageous to the Church ; and that the Bishop “be respectfully requested to consider under what regulations such an “order can be best established.”

Such is the proposition I shall submit to the Synod. First of all, I apprehend that there are very few of us, even in small parishes, who do not find that the work placed upon us is heavier than

our weak shoulders can well bear. It is important for men to know what they can and what they cannot bear ; but we in our parishes are very often constrained to undertake a variety, and almost a contrariety of duties at the same time, and the issue is, that we do not, perhaps, do scarcely one of them well. Now, one great assistance to us in our work, which would tend to remove this evil, for it is an evil which obstructs our progress,—would be the establishment of a permanent order of Deacons, in the sense that has just been explained by the Lord Bishop. There are many of us who cannot afford to have an assistant curate ; that is, one who comes to us for two years as deacon, and who is then translated to the priesthood ; or, if we can, the probabilities are strong, that so soon as our curate attains the order of the priesthood he leaves us, and the parish is thrown into a new set of feelings, of thoughts, and of instructions. When they come to us with a title to orders, they are contemplating leaving the place ; they are anticipating all the time they are with us, the pleasure of soon being at liberty to do as they please ; and the consequence naturally is, that there is a constant struggle of delicacy between the rector or vicar, and the curate, to take care that one does not encroach upon the other ; to see that the curate does not encroach upon the principal, and that the principal does not seem to direct over-much his subordinate. Now, there is nothing more important in the parochial ministry than unity of plan and system throughout the whole work. I am speaking of a sentiment which is peculiarly brought out in the work of Mr. Monro. I will not read the passage I refer to, but the sense of it is this, that if possible, the clergyman should take the entire spiritual department of his parish into his own hands, surrendering all mixed questions, all parochial and temporal matters, into other hands, and that he should, if possible, do the whole of the spiritual work himself. He points out the evil of one man taking the department of preaching, and thinking himself above the lower work of visiting the sick, and instructing the young ; and he shows how utterly impossible it is, that a man can preach well to his people, if he has not a knowledge of their individual cares and wants. The foundation of a good priest's sermon is good priestly intercourse with the souls of the people to whom he preaches. But it is absolutely impossible, with the present arrangements of our parishes, that the priest should have that sufficient knowledge of his people which would enable him to preach well, unless he surrenders much of the work he is now called upon to do ; the superintendence of various charities, the attendance at vestries, and so on. Now, if we had those who were ostensibly and provisionally permanent deacons, it would be understood at once that these men were subordinate, and were intended to be subordinate to the priest, with whom they were ministers. It is still intended in every parish, I apprehend, that there should be one who is in charge of the cure of souls, but it may be difficult in practice to carry it out.

The LORD BISHOP.—I hope not. I am not aware of a single parish in this diocese entrusted to a deacon. I found a good many so, but I

have at last been enabled to get rid of the practice in every parish, so far as I know. Is not that so, Mr. Barnes?

MR. BARNES.—I cannot venture to assert it is so, positively, my Lord, from memory; but it certainly is the rule in this diocese, and I believe it is really carried out.

THE REV. PREBENDARY OXENHAM.—I think your Lordship has mistaken my meaning. I did not intend to say there was not a priest in every parish, but that the priest who is the incumbent is not the single guiding mind and hand in his parish, because of the difficulty of getting curates from whom they can exact the necessary submission. I speak of my own experience as far as my term goes, because I have always had curates since I have been in priest's orders, and I have found the evils of our present system very great. The best curate I ever had left me in a few months. I apprehend that a permanent order of deacons would be in strict accordance with the practice of the Primitive Church. We have in our Church a thread of the skein by which we are to weave a spiritual web for the population, and in which we are to be zealous in catching men for heaven. It is a part of the spiritual web which we have not interwoven with the rest. But I think if there were a permanent order of deacons, who in many parishes might be available, the spiritual advantages of our people would be really incalculable. With reference, for example, to the ease of the collegiate establishment for the pastoral superintendence of youth, if it were possible to have a deacon, or two deacons in a parish, we could immediately place one of them as perpetual superintendent of the collegiate establishment, which I really think would remove the whole of the difficulty that has been felt upon that subject. I would here refer to the authority of one who has written upon this subject to me,—to the authority of one who has had experience not merely of deacons being employed in parishes usefully, but also of a college of priests and deacons in large and populous parishes.

"Question No. 4," he says, "is of great importance. It is most desirable to have a body of clergy who may be supposed from birth to have had the ordinary course of education of the middle and poorer classes, rather than that of those who have been educated at the Universities. Upon this and other grounds I hail with satisfaction and joy the introduction of literates into Holy Orders."

But he thinks, that under present regulations, the admission of literates into a permanent order of Deacons will probably not be fully successful, and mainly upon two grounds,—first, that they will feel themselves, from their want of an university education, to a certain extent in a degraded position, and apt to be irritated, and hurt at having one in a superior position whom they regard as upon an equality, chiefly because there is no provision at present for any distinct preparatory education before being admitted into holy orders. This is a wide question, not only as to Deacons, but as to all of us; and I may venture, parenthetically, to say this, that I think we must every one of us have felt grievously, when we first entered upon the practical cure of souls, to find the same lamentable need of some

special preparation for our work. I think, therefore, we may hail with the greatest satisfaction and thankfulness to our Heavenly Father, that there is already established one or two examples of preparatory colleges—at Wells and Chichester for instance, where this difficulty has been attempted to be met, and the working of which has been most eminently successful.

The LORD BISHOP.—The only one of the results of which I have had personal experience is that at Wells, and from the candidates who came to me from there I have found it impossible to speak too highly of the Institution that so prepared them. I dare say Chichester is equally good, but I have not happened to have candidates coming to me from there.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—Of Chichester I have seen a statement most entirely satisfactory, founded upon most competent authority. But to come back to the particular preparation of those who would be permanent deacons. It is further said in the paper from which I have already read—

“The Permanent Deacons should have a preparation for the special duties of the Diaconate, including the necessity of obedience, the merits of the parochial system, and other kindred subjects. By this means they would be able to grapple with the subjects to be brought before them : whereas, if they are permitted to preach only, their pulpit-orations are nothing but *rudis indigestaque moles*. Their sermons are, in point of composition, technical, and in point of application to the spiritual wants of the people, inapplicable.”

The LORD BISHOP.—It may be right to say, that I have restrained Deacons, even academic Deacons, from preaching out of their own parishes ; and I press it also upon them as much as possible that they should preach even there as little as is consistent with their being real assistants of the incumbent. I am glad, however, to have an opportunity of saying, I do not forbid it entirely. My directions are, that the Deacon is not at liberty to preach unless he is licensed by the Bishop ; and they must consider me as positively refusing my licence to preach out of their own parishes. Further, I wish them to consider themselves as bound not to preach in their own parishes more than shall be necessary actually for the assistance of their principal ; and that they must not consider themselves as equally entitled with him. I have also earnestly desired Deacons not to sit down and write their own crude notions, and pour them forth upon their congregations as sermons. I have strongly advised them that in what they preach they shall rather make abstracts of the best discourses of others ; and that they shall learn how to preach well by practising themselves in making abstracts from such sermons, for instance, as those of Bishop Andrewes. I have stated that they who can understand Bishop Andrewes so as to make abstracts of his Discourses, have already attained to a very great point of advancement in the business of writing sermons, though they may not yet know the necessity for it. I have not forbidden their preaching in their own parishes, but I certainly have discouraged them from preaching their

own crude notions. I am sure I have flung into the fire years ago what I preached when I was first ordained ; and I wish my Deacons would avail themselves much more of the labours of others—not by servilely copying the sermons of others, but by taking real pains in availing themselves of the labours and the wisdom of those great divines with whom, thank God, our Church is so largely supplied.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—I cannot but think that your Lordship's observations will be grateful to us all. We shall consider it, after such observations, one of the greatest benefits of this Synod, to have had the means of free intercourse with our spiritual Father in God. But in pursuing the subject of the Resolution, I proceed to observe, that it is important to remember that there are large classes of persons in the country who are in very many essential points qualified for the work of the ministry—men of deep, ardent piety, such as my reverend brother (Mr. Hext) spoke of yesterday, and with an earnest desire to make themselves useful, but not of academic education, to whom it is desirable to open a legitimate way for their admission to serve in the Church. The Church of Rome has been wiser than ourselves in this respect. The dissenting bodies have greatly the advantage over us in this respect. In any country village or small town, where a young person of a little more intellect and zeal than usual appears anxious for God's service, an opening is provided in some conventicle where he can—not because he prefers dissent to the Church, but because he cannot minister in the Church—make himself useful in that way. It is, therefore, I submit, most desirable that we should open a legitimate door for the admission of such persons into the service of the Church ; but then, it is material that there should be some distinct preparation for it. "A permanent diaconate," it is said by the same authority that I have already quoted, "would be a great boon to our rectors, vicars, and parochial incumbents." "But," it is added, "it would be needful to give, to a certain extent, the different courses of instruction to this portion of the students of the [Diocesan] College. A department might be set aside for persons recommended by the beneficed clergy as likely to prove assistants ; but the giving of a title, and the nomination of candidates, should be distinct from that of academics, because the course of instruction does really not fit men for orders." With these observations, I beg to move the Resolution.

The Rev. SIDNEY WILLIAM CORNISH seconded the Resolution.

The Venerable Archdeacon MOORE STEVENS.—It is extremely unpleasant for me to rise in opposition to this Resolution, but I feel I must speak according to my conscience. I agree in all that has been said upon the advantages that may be derived from such an appointment ; but, as a very humble minister of the Church, I also feel that I am rather trenching upon the province of others, when I affect to interfere, or even to suggest, matters to our Bishop, the tremendous responsibility of which must rest upon him. I have not one word to say against the arguments by which the Resolution has been supported. I shall not vote against it ; and I shall certainly deem it my duty

to abstain from voting at all upon a question which I think ought to be left to the decision of the Bishops of the Church of England.

The LORD BISHOP.—So far as I am the Bishop concerned, I will frankly say, that one advantage which I look for, from the consideration of such a subject by the Synod, is that suggestions may be made to me, and even the strong opinion of the body expressed to me. I should, after all, be bound to act upon my own conscientious view, even if that conscientious view were decidedly against the advice I so received. But I really should rejoice to receive advice upon every subject connected with my administration of this Diocese; therefore, personally, I feel very much the kind suggestion of the Archdeacon who would wish to spare me the annoyance of seeming to resist the dictation of a vote of a meeting. But I should still feel myself responsible—I feel that—though not to the Synod. The Synod advise, but if I act upon their advice it would be I that would be responsible; for I should blush for myself if I were to say, “It is not my fault, it is the fault of the Synod.” I frankly own I shall, after all, consult my own conscience and judgment; and what they tell me I shall act up to. At the same time I should be very sorry if that declaration should stop your making any suggestions whatever: it is sufficient for me, that I reserve the right of acting upon my own judgment. With regard to the other Bishops, I wish with all my heart that that objection applied as strongly as it ought to do. I wish that we were in a state of mutual cooperation and consultation as Bishops, as to the administration of our several Dioceses. But from circumstances which I must decline entering into, and not at all with regard to myself personally, not in the slightest degree, but as belonging to the whole state of the Episcopate, brought about by matters which I should be peculiarly unwilling to refer to in this meeting, there is, in fact, no communication among us whatever. Therefore, that being so, I do entreat this Synod to advise me, individually, as the Bishop; and in that way I shall be glad to exercise my own judgment.

The Ven. Archdeacon MOORE STEVENS.—I quite acquiesce in the benefit of this question being discussed before your Lordship, and I am also aware that your Lordship is very glad to hear the objections that are addressed to the meeting on this important subject. The utility of the discussion I readily admit: but I must decline being a party to a Resolution to the effect proposed, because I think I am thereby travelling out of my duty.

The Rev. Chancellor HARRINGTON.—I should be very unwilling for it to go forth that we are to receive these young men into the Diocesan Training College. If it goes to the world that the inmates of that College are to be ordained Deacons, very great evils will, I am sure, accrue to the College. The attempts we are making to erect it will be altogether suppressed, because the youth whom we take in to train as masters will not stop there; for if we admit parties who are looking forward to the Diaconate, they will prompt other pupils to the same high distinction.

The Rev. JOHN WOLLASTON KARSLAKE.—In this Diocese, has there been found a competent number of applicants, as candidates for orders, to fill localities where additional curates are desirable? Certainly a more highly educated class of men are anxious to come into the Church; but I think we ought to be satisfied whether it would not be more advantageous to the Church to have them trained in an University. But if there be a lack of labourers in Christ's vineyard, I think that young men who wish to go into the ministry should be encouraged.

The LORD BISHOP.—There is an enormous lack. Speaking as Bishop, I know there are many parishes in this great Diocese in which accepting such individuals as are alluded to would be very important, and where it would be in vain to attempt to have academics. I am also quite alive to the danger of diminishing the fair number of positions for academics. We never can expect there should not be conflicting interests: but they must be left to the Bishop.

The Rev. Dr. HARRIS.—I would beg, with the permission of your Lordship and the Synod, to read the Resolution passed at the rural-decanal Chapter which I represent:—"That in our opinion the increase of authorized teachers and assistants of ministers, which is so much to be desired in many populous places, might be promoted, if any plan could be devised for considerably diminishing the expenses of an university or other fitting education." It does not come within the province of this Synod, I apprehend, to express any strong opinion upon the subject; but the mere fact that the idea has been entertained, and that it is possible, possesses considerable importance. The suggestion from such a body to the Universities, that it would be desirable to institute some means by which the lower order of ministers of whom we are thinking, could be educated for the Ministry at a very diminished expense at the Universities, would really be a very practical way of promoting the object now under consideration. And it was thought at our Decanal meeting, that the mere fact of the subject having been mentioned here might have some effect upon the Universities in this respect.

The LORD BISHOP then put the Resolution, and declared it carried. There were seven dissentients.

LAY ASSISTANCE.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—The next Resolution I shall ask to propose will be:—

11. "That it is desirable for the Parochial Clergy to obtain, as far as possible, the aid of their lay parishioners, especially by encouraging voluntary associations for good works, provided always that care be taken not to transgress the discipline of the Church."

I think it is desirable this should be done, for several reasons. One is, lest the public should derive the impression that we, as a Synod, reject the assistance of the Laity—whereas it is essential to our influence as Clergy, and it ought to be essential that we should,

as far as possible, avail ourselves of the aid of the Laity—that they should do their proper work and we should do ours. But we should by no means sever ourselves from them in the practical correction and management of our parishes. I think it is of very great importance that there should be a statement of opinion given upon the subject by us, since it has been submitted to us for some decision or other—that we should at least say it is desirable for the parochial Clergy to obtain as far as possible lay assistance by encouraging voluntary associations for good works, provided also that care be taken not to infringe the direct discipline of the Church. I will refer only to two authorities, both of which are printed, as to the detailed method of carrying out the spirit of this Resolution. One is Mr. Monro, from p. 243, of his “Parochial Work.”

The LORD BISHOP.—It is right that the Synod should be informed by me, that upon a matter similar to this, there was a meeting of the Bishops some few years ago. The proposition then was, to give assistance to the Ministers of populous parishes by the appointment of officers, called Lay-Readers, who were to be licensed by the Bishop, after being nominated, with a salary, by a Society in London. It was my misfortune, on that occasion, to differ from all, but one, of my colleagues, in declining to assent to the proposed scheme. I declined on several accounts; but, especially, because I could not undertake the responsibility of creating a *quasi* new Order in the Church. This, as you may remember, was stated to you by me at the time when the discussion arose. But the proposition contained in the Resolution before us is, I need hardly say, of a very different kind. It has nothing to do with the introduction of foreigners; if it had, I should look on it with suspicion and apprehension. In saying this, I should be sorry to be understood as implying censure on one or two strangers who may have been already introduced amongst us. Of one in particular, brought into a district at Devonport, I am glad to say that I believe he made himself very useful, and established a very good character: upon which, the Incumbent requested that I would ordain him Deacon, as I had ordained some others, who were not academics. I sent for the young man, and told him, that, while I had no doubt of his good character, the fact of his having been sent into my Diocese as a lay-teacher, by a Society in London, was conclusive against my ordaining him. But the Resolution now proposed, I repeat, does not relate to such cases; it refers to lay *parishioners*—and I have no hesitation in saying, that I look on such a proposition most favourably. For, I ask, what can we do? There is an undoubted want of assistance to the Clergy of populous parishes, which must be sought from some quarter. If you apply to distant Societies, you will have persons sent to you invested with an official character; and, whatever may be professed or intended, practically more or less independent on him whom they are appointed to assist. Such a person, in such a position, is too likely to presume on that independence, to regard himself as a Church-officer, and, it may be, if any difference arise, to beard the minister in his own parish. Surely, if a Clergy-

man, entrusted with one of these populous districts, will look around him, he can hardly fail to find, among his own people, persons able and willing to aid him most effectually—and this under regulations which will make them real assistants, and no more than assistants; carrying out the plans of the incumbent, without attempting to set up for themselves. It may be said, that there must always be a danger of such attempts being made. This may be true: but there is only 'a danger on one side, while there is an absolute necessity on the other; and I must say, that dangers, or other objections to what is necessary, ought not to be regarded as reasons against the thing itself, but only as cautions as to the manner in which it is carried out. Now, it cannot admit of doubt, that in the mining districts of Cornwall, and in those of Plymouth and its contiguous towns, there is a necessity, which the most zealous and vigorous Clergyman would, if left to himself, find absolutely overwhelming. In such cases, without lay assistants, very much of what is of prime moment to the very end and purpose of the Christian ministry must be left undone, which, with such assistance, may be, and therefore ought to be, done. I must also say, that no parochial minister, in such a position, can be considered to have discharged his duty fully, till he shall have exerted to the utmost, not only his own energies, but also every expedient which presents a reasonable hope of correcting or mitigating the fearful evils which he sees around him. Of these expedients, a well-regulated system of lay-assistance seems to me to be manifestly among the most likely to be effectual and beneficial. What its regulations ought to be, is a question which every minister, so circumstanced, must decide for himself; but he will find in the experience of others an aid, which none of you will disdain to seek—an aid, which, we may hope, meetings such as this are very likely to give. I have stated the grounds of the opinion on which I have acted, in discouraging the introduction of salaried strangers, and promoting in preference the having recourse to voluntary Parochial lay assistants. Having stated this, I will add, that I am open to conviction—and, if I am wrong, I shall be glad to have the benefit of your counsel, and the results of your experience, to convince me that I am wrong.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—I think that your Lordship's admirable observations rather enforce than detract from the Resolution. I would refer in the next place to Mr. Carter's pamphlet dedicated to Prince Albert. This subject is largely referred to in that pamphlet; but I will only say that in the neighbourhood of Windsor he has carried out to a considerable extent—both in a country parish as well as in Windsor—the operation of lay assistants. There the clergy concur with him, and have a voice in the Committee meetings, and there the work is such as laymen may do. There are several such societies now in actual operation under the patronage of the Queen and Prince Albert, which are doing, at this moment, a great amount of good. I do think that similar societies, with modifications according to circumstances, would be found, in a great many of our parishes, of very great use indeed. I may also just refer to Flower's "Plea for the

Poor." It contains many valuable arguments in favour of the general position. But I conclude by moving the Resolution.

The Rev. Dr. COLERIDGE.—I beg to second the Resolution. I do not believe there is any one parish from Exmouth to the Land's End, where the Clergy will not be most thankful to receive the assistance of the laity ; and I believe that throughout the Diocese the laity are instrumental in the care of our parishes, as far as they can be, and that they are in many cases at this time waiting for invitations from us, to aid us in the discharge of our duties.

The LORD BISHOP then put the Resolution, and the Synod adopted it unanimously.

WEEK-DAY SERVICES, &c.

The Rev. JOHN ALLEN.—I will at once read the Resolution in my hands :—

"Resolved, that in the opinion of the Synod it is desirable that at least in the populous parishes of the Diocese, there be a return to the prescribed order of morning and evening prayer daily throughout the year ; and that in every parish church of the Diocese there be a celebration of Divine service upon one or more days of the week exclusive of Sunday ; and also that it is desirable that in each parish church of the Diocese there be a due observance of the days appointed by the Church to be kept holy, and that upon Ascension Day (there being in the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper a Preface specially ordained,) the Holy Communion be always administered ; and that it is highly desirable that more frequent opportunities than are usual be given to members of the Church of England of receiving the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in accordance with the practice of the primitive Christians : and with a view to this end especially, that it seems expedient, at least in many parishes, to have such an arrangement that sometimes on days when the Holy Communion is administered, either the Morning Prayer or the Office for the Holy Communion form an early service by itself."

This is the Resolution, which, as the subjects 6, 7, and 8 upon the paper are intimately connected, I submit as a whole. With regard to No. 6, "more frequent Divine services in churches on week-days, due observance of the days appointed by the Church to be kept holy, and on Ascension Day the Lord's Supper to be always administered," it may be objected that we have already power to do that which we now ask this Synod to recommend us to do. I admit that ; but it is undoubted that to have the power, and the expediency of exercising it, are two distinct things. Having been fifteen years in the ministry, I will not say that I have been unwilling, but that I have been unable to exercise it. On such a recommendation, however, I shall not be at all unwilling to carry it out. It seems to me with regard to No. 6, that it is a very unsatisfactory state of things, that our parish churches should be open, in many cases, upon the Sunday only. This does seem in some degree to leave our parishes in an unsanctified state ;

it prevents them from having those fervent and effectual prayers which avail much, and which may, under God's blessing, turn the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just. We may not at first reap the fruits we expect; but I believe, if we persevere in the practice, that in due season we shall reap, if we faint not. With regard to the observance of days appointed by the Church to be kept holy, I believe that is not only desirable but practicable; and I believe that owing to the absence of them our parishioners, especially in poor parishes, know very little about the lives, history, and deaths of the blessed saints. These observations will also apply to the last paragraph in No. 6: "On Ascension Day the Lord's Supper to be always administered." If it be expedient to keep that day holy, it will follow as a matter of course that the Holy Communion should be administered. In moving the Resolution, I beg to say that I have spoken to No. 6 only; and that the Synod will be addressed upon the others by a reverend brother who will second the Resolution.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—I beg to second the Resolution, but before addressing the Synod upon it, I will read it as a whole. [The reverend gentleman here read the Resolution throughout.] Such is the Resolution, the adoption of which I have to second. First of all, as to the daily prayers in large and populous parishes, where alone this Resolution says they are expedient. That there should be in our churches daily prayers to God for our people, is so manifest, and so important, that I really should be grieved beyond measure if this Holy Synod doubted about accepting this portion of the Resolution. We know it is the fashion of this unbelieving, godless age to talk of prayers to Almighty God as if they were a small part of Divine service; but I need not speak to you, my reverend brethren, in contradiction of such a notion. It is important, however, that we should affirm our contradiction of such a false and dangerous notion. It is impossible but we should, if we believe prayer is the life of the soul, and that our united prayers to God are the life of the body corporate of the Church;—if we believe that our Saviour did give a special promise that where two or three are gathered together in His name He would be there among them—if that was given to His Apostles as His ministers, and if the blessing of that promise descends upon ourselves—if we believe all this, how can we doubt that where there is a very large population gathered together under one minister, he is bound to give them a daily opportunity of offering up, in the Courts of the Lord's House, their prayers, their praises, and their thanksgivings? I think I need say no more upon that point. The second portion of the Resolution is, that in parishes not populous there should be a celebration of Divine service upon one or more days in the week exclusive of Sunday. I think the arguments which apply to daily services in large parishes will hold good to the extent of one additional service besides those which are commanded by law. I cannot think that even in the smallest parishes, except under most peculiar circumstances, one day set apart for public prayer can be considered too much. Let us now look at the effects produced upon the minds

of our people by the fact of a clergyman, sworn to be the guide and teacher of the people in that same duty of prayer, never reading prayers in public from one Sunday to another, especially when they find that others who come into the parish, sometimes with fatal doctrines of heresy, and sometimes with most mischievously false doctrines, almost invariably summon them to united prayer, more than once or twice a-week. The contrast is drawn. We may not choose to draw it, but *it is* drawn. It is felt, too, by our people; they who ask them to prayer, and pray with them, understand the evil of it: and if we do not ask them we shall also. They say one man must pray because he is a paid servant, and the other because he fears God. I think then that we are not saying too much when we say that for one day in the week, at least, our church-doors should be opened, besides the day when they must be open. We next come to that part of the Resolution which relates to the due observance of the days appointed by the Church to be kept holy. I shall not say a word about that. I trust that no one desires to be convinced of that. If our Prayer-Book has any weight we are bound to hear what it teaches as to that. The Resolution then goes on, "That upon Ascension Day, " there being in the Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper " a Preface specially appointing the Holy Communion to be always " administered." That I think very important; I freely confess that in my own church it has not been done; I confess my short-comings in this respect, but I most earnestly pray that the offence which might be given by a single clergyman introducing the practice in his church may be done away by the united voice of all of us, supporting that which is the bounden duty of us all. Then I come to the next part of the Resolution, which says that "It is highly desirable that more " frequent opportunities than are usual should be given to members of " the Church of England, of receiving the Blessed Communion of the " Lord's Supper, in accordance with the practice of the primitive " Christians."

The Venerable Archdeacon MOORE STEVENS.—And which now is the practice in the cathedral, where the Holy Communion is celebrated weekly.

The Rev. Prebendary OXENHAM.—Then we who are the clergymen of the daughter churches, cannot do better than follow the excellent example set us by our mother. Next, with a view to this end the Resolution says, "It seems expedient, at least in many parishes, to " have such an arrangement, that sometimes on days when the Holy " Communion is administered, either the Morning Prayer or the Office " for the Holy Communion form an early service by itself." I would say, in reference to this point, of the distinction in the service, only a few words. Some of my reverend brethren may not know the fact, that until the last revision of the Prayer-Book, in 1661, the Litany was designed to be a distinct service by itself, to be used some time after the Morning Prayer was over; and upon reference to the Prayer-Book of King Edward VI. it will be found that the Litany is there printed after the Communion Service, or before the Baptismal Service. In the

first Prayer-Book of King Edward it was not directed to be said even upon Sundays ; and in the second Prayer-Book of King Edward there are directions that it should be said upon Sundays, or only in combination with the other services. Bishop Mant said the Litany was intended to come after Matins, or before the Office of the Holy Communion, at a proper distance of time, of which custom the Church preserves still, or did until lately, some few remains. Upon this subject, Bishop Selwyn, addressing the Synod which he called, distinctly affirmed, that he entirely sanctioned the separation of the Matins, the Litany, and the Holy Communion, at the discretion of the Clergyman, provided, nevertheless, that each portion of the service was used entire, unmutilated, and unmixed with other portions. All then which this Resolution, which I venture to submit upon the subject, says, is that “ in some instances, and in some parishes, it may “ be desirable to have some arrangement, that sometimes, on days when “ the Holy Communion is administered, either the Morning Prayer, “ or the office for the Litany, may form an early service by itself.”

It now being time for Even-song in the cathedral, the Synod adjourned. Shortly after four o'clock the Synod re-assembled, when

The LORD BISHOP said.—There has been a Resolution containing several particulars brought before us, of great importance, upon which we are now to come to some decision. I think, however, it may be for the convenience of the Synod, and I dare say that both Mr. Allen and Mr. Prebendary Oxenham will consent to it, that each proposition should be put separately. It is not an unusual course of proceeding, that a string of Resolutions should be spoken to altogether, but put singly ; and if that meets the wishes of the Synod, I think it would be the best course in this instance. The first proposition, then, which will be before the meeting will be the following :—

12. “ Resolved that this Synod do invite the earnest attention of the “ Clergy of this Diocese to the several Orders of the Church in the “ Book of Common Prayer and in the Canons, respecting the saying “ daily of the Morning and Evening Prayer.”

After considerable verbal discussion, it was moved by Mr. ALLEN, and seconded by Mr. Prebendary OXENHAM,—

“ Also that the earnest attention of the Clergy of the diocese be “ invited to the 13th and 14th Canons, as to the due observance of “ Holy Days ; and that it is the firm opinion of this Synod that the “ due observance of Ascension Day includes the celebration of Holy “ Communion—a special Preface being provided.”

This Resolution, on being put by the LORD BISHOP, was unanimously carried.

The time having now arrived for the proceedings to be brought to a close, although from lack of time all the matters upon the paper had not been considered,

The LORD BISHOP said.—I will now proceed to end this Synod. But before I do that, my reverend friends, let me in one word thank you from my heart for your attendance, for the great attention you have given to the important subjects brought before you, and for the

inestimable support you have given to the cause of true religion in this Diocese. May God, in His mercy, accept such service !

PRAYERS SAID AT THE CONCLUSION OF THE SYNOD.

Standing up, the LORD BISHOP said.—Our help standeth in the Name of the Lord.

R.—Who made Heaven and Earth.

B.—Turn us again, O Lord God of Hosts.

R.—Show the light of Thy countenance, and we shall be whole.

B.—Lord, hear our Prayer.

R.—And let our cry come unto Thee.

Let us Pray.

O-LORD GOD, who knowest our sin and imperfection, and yet hast vouchsafed unto us grace to celebrate this holy Synod in Thy Name : We humbly beseech Thee for Thy Son's sake to accept our good purposes and our imperfect prayers ; as well those which we offered at the beginning of our assembly, as those with which we now solemnize its conclusion. O Lord, spare our ignorance, allow for our wanderings, prosper what we have endeavoured for the good of Thy Holy Church ; and as by the gift of the Holy Ghost the Comforter, Thou wast pleased to unite the several nations in the Confession of one holy Faith, so vouchsafe to preserve this Thy Clergy and People, with our Sovereign Lady the Queen, in the Unity of the same Faith : that obeying Thine Admonitions, defended by Thee from all evils, and endowed with all good gifts, we with all Thy whole Church may serve Thee here in tranquillity and freedom, and hereafter be found meet for a portion in Thine Eternal City ; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Our Father which art in Heaven, Hallowed be Thy Name ; Thy Kingdom come ; Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven ; Give us this day our daily bread ; And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us ; And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil : For Thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory, For ever and ever. *Amen.*

The Blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you and remain with you always. *Amen.*

Then the Synod stood up, and the Archdeacon of Exeter said,

“ In the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, let us go in Peace.”

Thereupon the Synod departed, as they had assembled, in peace. *Amen.*

A P P E N D I X.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO THE BISHOP'S ADDRESS, AT PAGE 33.

We have seen, that the Archdeacon says, that "in the Creeds of various Churches, the Article is expressed in such a manner, as absolutely to *exclude all reference to the efficacy of Baptism* ; and that S. Cyril of Jerusalem, recording the Creed of that Church, speaks of 'one Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,' thus connecting *the remission of sins, not with Baptism, but with repentance.*"

It is very true, that S. Cyril cites the Article, as the Archdeacon represents : but this was when he was *Catechist*—that is, at least as early as the year 350, in which year he was made Bishop, more than thirty years before the Council of Constantinople, in 381. Since, then, he and the other Fathers, at that Council, deliberately struck out of the old eastern Creed the words "of repentance," and exhibited the Article in its present form—"one Baptism for the remission of sins,"—it follows, on the Archdeacon's own principle, but in direct contradiction to his conclusion, that the authority of the Fathers of the second General Council must be cited, as "*excluding all reference to the efficacy of everything except Baptism,*" and as "connecting the remission of sins, *not with repentance, but with Baptism.*"

In respect to the case of *infants*, in particular, it is quite certain, that the Greek Church strongly maintained the efficacy of the grace given to them *in and by Baptism*. The 84th Canon of the Council of Trullo, (*i. e. the Dome of the Imperial Palace at Constantinople*, in which it was holden A.D. 692,) is to this effect : "*Following the canonical decrees of the Fathers, we define in the case of infants, that, whenever there be not found sure witnesses of their having been baptized, and they are unable, by reason of their own tender age, to answer for their having received that holy Sacrament, they ought, without scruple, to be baptized, lest such scruple should deprive them of the sanctification derived from that their purification* ἀποσπέρηση αὐτὰ τῆς τοιαύτης τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ καθάρσεως." This Canon is taken from the 6th Canon of the 5th Council of Carthage, in 398.

It is further worthy of remark, that the same Council of Trullo, in its 2d Canon, expressly confirmed the Canons of the Council of

Carthage, holden A.D. 419, being a collection of the Canons made in several preceding Councils at Carthage, and other cities of Africa, (from the year 348 onwards,) and called, on that account, the African Code. Of this African Code, the 110th Canon is as follows:—

“ *Quod infantes in peccatorum Remissionem baptizentur.*”

“ Item placuit, ut quicumque parvulos recentes infantes quidem
 “ ab uteris matrum baptizandos esse negat; vel dicit in remissionem
 “ peccatorum eos baptizari, non autem ex primi Parentis Adam peccato
 “ quidquam trahere, quod debeat lavacro regenerationis purgari;
 “ (unde est consequens, quod in his *forma Baptismatis in remissionem*
 “ *peccatorum* non vera, sed falsa intelligatur) *sit Anathema*: quoniam
 “ non aliter intelligere oportet quod ab Apostolo dictum est ‘ Per
 “ ‘ unum hominem peccatum introivit in mundum, et per peccatum
 “ ‘ mors, et sic in omnes homines pervasit, in quo omnes peccaverunt,’
 “ nisi quemadmodum Catholica Ecclesia, quæ ubique diffusa est et
 “ simplex, *semper* intellexit. Propter hanc enim fidei regulam *in-*
 “ *fantes* quoque, qui nihil peccatorum ex se committere potuerunt, *vere*
 “ *in peccatorum Remissionem baptizantur, ut per regenerationem in eis*
 “ *vere mundetur, quod ab antiqua origine contraxerunt.*”

How would the Fathers, who in their Canons thus construe this Article of the Creed, have dealt with our Archdeacon, if he had put forth his glosses upon it in their days?

THE END.





